THE

NORTH AMERICAN

REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1883.

No. 323.

Tros Tyriusque mihi nullo discrimine agetur.

NEW YORK:
No. 30 LAFAYETTE PLACE.
1883.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COPYRIGHT BY
ALLEN THORNDIKE RICE.
1883.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

OCTOBER, 1883.

ART.		PAGE
I.	GOLD AND SILVER AS STANDARDS OF VALUE. By N. P. HILL, United States Senator.	307
II.	SOME ASPECTS OF DEMOCRACY IN ENGLAND. By A. V. DICEY.	317
III.	COÖPERATIVE DISTRIBUTION. By the Rev. R. HEBER NEWTON, D. D.	327
IV.	EARLY MAN IN AMERICA. By Prof. W. BOYD DAWKINS.	338
V.	ASTRONOMICAL COLLISIONS. By Prof. C. A. YOUNG.	350
VI.	THE SAINT PATRICK MYTH. By MONCURE D. CONWAY.	358
VII.	BOARD OF TRADE MORALITY. By VAN BUREN DENSLOW.	372
VIII.	HISTORIES OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION. By FREDERIC HARRISON.	388
IX.	SOCIAL FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES. By the Rev. E. E. HALE, D. D.	403

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW.

No. CCCXXIII.

OCTOBER, 1883.

GOLD AND SILVER AS STANDARDS OF VALUE.

In the contest, which has been waged for a number of years, between the advocates of mono-metallism and bi-metallism, it has become apparent that the majority of the people of this country desire that silver, as well as gold, should be coined, at least to the limited extent provided for by the act of 1878. They desire it, not for the purpose of inflating the currency, nor for the purpose of benefiting certain sections of the country in which silver mining constitutes an important and profitable industry, as has been so often derisively charged by the mono-metallists, but for the broader and more equitable purpose of preserving uniformity in the value of metallic money, and more especially to prevent such a contraction of the total volume of money as would fatally depress prices, pervert the equity of contracts, ruin debtors and tax-payers, aggrandize moneyed capital, and impoverish the masses of the people.

Justice to all classes of people—to the poor and the rich, to the laborer and the capitalist, to the debtor and the creditor—requires that we should so legislate as to preserve for money, as nearly as possible, a uniform value, or, in other words, a steady purchasing power. The money which the borrower should pay the lender, at the maturity of the debt, should be of the same value as that which was received when the debt was made.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Since the passage of the act of 1878, by the coinage of silver, the United States have added about $150,000,000 to the metallic money of the country. That it has not thereby created an inflation of the currency, and that that none is threatened, but that the volume of money is too small rather than too large, is shown by a tendency to falling prices.

The address of Mr. Goschen, April 8, 1883, before the London Institute of Bankers, upon the increase of the purchasing power of gold, or, in other words, upon the fall in the gold price of commodities, within ten years, has excited lively discussion in Europe and in this country. The criticisms upon his address have been varied and numerous; but none of his critics have denied his proposition that prices have fallen, or that Mr. Goschen is right in assigning, as one of the conspicuous causes of the fall, the increased demand for gold arising from the demonetization of silver by several countries. They have not, so far as I have observed, gone beyond the attempt to show that Mr. Goschen has somewhat overstated the new demand for gold, and that the other causes for a fall in prices are more numerous than he supposed them to be.

The London "Times," which, upon the whole, does not regard the fall of prices as a thing to be deprecated, or as affording an occasion for measures to relieve the constriction of gold, says in its issue of May 7, 1883:

"Prices at the present day are, on the whole, lower than they were ten years ago. They are as low, or nearly as low, as they were in the old days before the great gold discoveries had been made. . . . It is certain, as Mr. Goschen says, that prices of commodities are affected by changes in the volume of the circulating medium in which they are expressed. . . . Germany, Italy, and the United States have, during the past ten years, been absorbing in their currency more gold than the available supply. They have taken between them not less £200,000,000, and a large part of this has necessarily been obtained at the expense of the general stock. The result has been that, as the stock of gold has diminished, the price of gold has gone up; or, in other words, that the prices of commodities have fallen. It is impossible that so large a drain of gold can have failed to affect prices. Mr. Goschen must be admitted to have made out his case thus far. He has laid his finger on a cause, and it is demonstrably a *vera causa*, capable of the effect he assigns to it. But an examination of his figures will show that other causes have been concurrently at work."

It is difficult to compute the exact rise and fall of the general range of the prices of commodities, and persons desirous of ascer-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

taining the truth may differ somewhat in the results at which they arrive. The method lately adopted by esteemed English authorities, as affording the closest approximation to accuracy, is that of comparing the prices in different years of all the articles imported into and exported from Great Britain, in respect to which the Custom-house statements admit of tracing the relation between quantity and money valuation. This is true of about three-fourths of the whole mass of imports and exports. Considering the immense magnitude of British foreign commence, and that it embraces almost everything that is bought and sold by mankind, either for consumption or as raw materials for manufactures, it would seem that the prices of commodities could not be more reliably ascertained.

Robert Giffen, Secretary of the British Board of Trade, in a paper read March 21, 1882, before the London Statistical Society, said in respect to the fall of prices in Great Britain during six years ending with 1879: "The range of difference in the aggregate values of the exports of the United Kingdom, owing to the difference of price alone, amounted to thirty per cent. between 1873 and 1879."

The determination of the German Government to adopt a single gold standard was announced by decrees in December, 1871, but during 1872 nothing was done beyond coining about $100,000,000. It was in 1873 that the demonetization of silver, the melting of silver coins, and the sale of bullion, by the German Government, actually began. The six following years were marked by a continuous and extraordinary fall in prices and depression of industry throughout the whole commercial world. There may have been other and contributory causes for this fall and depression; but it cannot be successfully controverted, and I believe it has never been denied by financial writers upon the subject, that among the principal causes was the silver demonetization of Germany, followed by a similar policy in Denmark, Sweden, Norway, and the United States.

Since 1877 the London "Economist" has made semi-annual and annual comparisons of the prices of imported and exported articles. In its issue of January 27, 1883, it exhibits the prices for each of the five calendar years ending with 1882. The starting point of its comparison is $1,422,200,000 of imports and $714,550,000 of exports in 1877. It then proceeds to show the changes in the aggregate money valuation of the same articles in each of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the next five years, as compared with the immediately preceding year, which resulted from changes in price, and excluding the effect of changes in quantity.

From the figures of the "Economist" it appears that there was in 1880 an increase of $105,450,000; but in each of the other four years a decrease as follows:

Years.	*Decrease of Prices.*	*Years.*	*Decrease of Prices.*
1878	$138,250,000	1881	$48,800,000
1879	113,300,000	1882	30,650,000

The comparisons of the "Economist" which cover articles dealt in by the British foreign trade, of the enormous value of $2,137,750,000 in 1877, are the best attainable evidence of the fluctuation of prices throughout the commercial world. The year 1877 was itself the fourth year of a period of falling prices which commenced in 1873, the date of the German demonetization of silver.

When the agitation for a single metallic standard was commenced by Chevalier and others in 1855–6, immediately after the great out-turn of gold by California and Australia, the sole ground upon which it was based was the danger, if the world continued to use both the metals as money, of a depreciation of the money standard and of a hurtful inflation of prices; but now, in the presence of a large and continuing fall in prices, it has become apparent that the use of both the metals will be required, and may not even be adequate to prevent a monetary constriction, which will lower the value of all forms of property.

The New York "Public," although it ably and persistently advocates the discarding of the use of silver money, is forced to admit that gold is growing dearer and the gold price of merchandise lower. I quote from its issue of March 23, 1883:

> "The year 1882 was one of remarkably general and important decline in prices, both in this country, in Great Britain, and on the Continent. Generally speaking, the purchasing power of gold was decidedly increased during the year 1882 throughout the western world."

The rise of prices, commencing in this country in 1879 and a little later in Europe, proved to be only a temporary reaction, such as will occur in any general course of the markets, whether up or down. It was assisted undoubtedly by the resumption of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

silver coinage in this country, under the act of 1878, notwithstanding the hostile, halting, and partial administration of that law.

The writer of the article in the London "Times," already quoted from, endeavors to allay the fears of mankind, as to a further rise in gold, by making the following observations:

"Mr. Goschen's calculations do not help us to forecast the purchasing power of gold. The drain of gold has been temporary. The supply goes on, and apart from the exceptional demand of the last ten years, it is in excess of the world's wants. How, then, will the case stand when the world at large has recouped itself for its late losses? The tendency of things seems to point to a lower value of gold, unless, indeed, some other nations are to be found to do what Germany, Italy, and the United States have been doing, and to absorb, or more than absorb, the whole future yield. If nothing of that kind happens, we may look for a return to higher money prices. It is more certain that the supply of gold will continue than that the demand will rise in proportion. Again, a rise in the value of gold serves as a stimulus to the production of gold."

It is quite impossible to mistake the animus of the organ of British opinion when it makes so many gratuitous assumptions and overlooks so many obvious facts. There is no ground for the affirmation that the out-turn of the gold mines during the last decade would have been in "excess of the world's wants," or, in other words, would have done anything more than keep prices steady, if silver had not been demonetized in Germany and the United States.

It is true that "a rise in the value of gold serves as a stimulus" to mining for it; but it is also true that the production cannot be enlarged at will, as can be the production of wheat or cotton, but is limited by such fortuitous circumstances as the discovery of mines; and, in point of fact, its actual production has been declining during the last ten years, while its value has been rising.

That the fall in prices, during the last ten years, may be accounted for in part by the demonetization of silver does not admit of a doubt, but there are other conspicuous causes for the fall which have been generally overlooked by writers upon this subject. I refer to the large increase in the consumption of gold in the arts and manufactures and to the decrease in the production of the mines.

Soetbeer, who has been the principal writer and statistician

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the supporters of the gold mono-metallic policy of Germany, printed two exhaustive essays in 1881, the first upon the world's production of gold during the fifty years ending with 1880, and the second upon the consumption of that metal in the arts during the same time in Europe, America, and Australia, and exclusive of Asia and Africa. No living statistician enjoys a higher reputation for industry and care, and of course he cannot be suspected of a desire to underrate the annual supply of gold for monetary purposes, which is the excess of its production above its consumption in the arts. He gives the following table:

Decade ending with	*Gold produced in the world.*	*Gold consumption in the arts in Europe, America, and Australia, exclusive of old materials used.*
1840	$134,915,830	$119,629,100
1850	364,206,280	132,922,000
1860	1,341,182,290	186,090,800
1870	1,252,789,850	382,150,750
1880	1,131,830,830	556,092,070

During the decade ending with 1880 the average annual consumption of gold was $55,609,207, but inasmuch as there has been a constant and large increase of consumption, in recent years, the actual consumption must have been much greater at the end than at the beginning of the decade. We may fairly estimate that $55,609,207 was the consumption of the middle year of the decade, and that the increase during the eight years that have since elapsed has been $13,915,304. This is, of course, assuming that the annual increase of $1,739,413, which is shown by comparing the decade ending with 1880 with the decade ending with 1870, has continued through the past eight years. There are many facts going to show that the increase for the past eight years has been more rapid.

If the figures of Soetbeer are correct, and they are generally admitted by statisticians on this subject to closely approximate correctness, the annual consumption of gold in the arts in Europe, America, and Australia is at the rate of $69,524,511. In reaching these figures Soetbeer has made an allowance of from ten to twenty-five per cent. in the different countries, for gold obtained from old articles of ornamentation, which have been remanufactured.

In no country has the effort to ascertain the consumption of the precious metals in the arts, by government authority, been

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more thorough than in the United States. It was undertaken here for the first time by Mr. Burchard, Director of the United States Mint, and has been executed with creditable industry, care, and skill. In addition to obtaining from the assay offices the delivery of gold to jewelers, he has received replies to thousands of letters addressed to persons engaged in all the arts in which the precious metals are used. His conclusion, as given in his last annual report, is that the gross consumption of gold in the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1882, exceeded $12,000,000. He says the statistics do not justify a larger deduction than ten per cent. for old jewelry and plate, in arriving at the net consumption of gold in the arts in that year, which therefore exceeded $10,800,000 of new gold. This is $1,827,765 more than the average annual net consumption of this country during the decade ending with 1880, as given in Soetbeer's tables.

The Director of our Mint, in his annual report for November, 1881, says: "From a review of the information published in this and preceding reports and other authorities, I estimate that, including the annual consumption in the United States of $11,000,000 of gold and $6,000,000 of silver, the annual consumption of the world in ornamentation, manufactures, and the arts is at least $75,000,000 of gold and $35,000,000 of silver."

To the consumption of gold in the arts in Europe, America, and Australia is to be added the steady importation of that metal by British India, where it is not used as money, but is worked into ornaments by the native artisans. It is so common to speak of that country as an absorbent of silver, that we have overlooked the fact that it is also a large absorbent of gold. The official figures of its foreign trade show that, during the thirty years ending with 1880, the average annual excess of Indian imports of gold over exports was $16,018,330.

The importation of gold by India continues unabated, and may be expected to increase with the rapidly advancing wealth of that country. But taking it at the average rate for thirty years, we have the following results:

Annual gold consumption in Europe, Australia, and America	$69,524,511
In India	16,018,330
Total	$85,542,841

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The average annual gold production of the world, during the decade ending with 1880, was, according to Soetbeer's table, $113,183,083; but, as it was at a declining rate, it was less in 1880. Soetbeer estimated it for that year at $101,000,000, and Sir Hector Hay at $95,000,000. The estimates of Mr. Burchard, Director of the United States Mint, are higher, being, for three calendar years, as follows:

1879	$108,778,807
1880	106,436,786
1881	107,773,157

Wells, Fargo and Company estimate the production of the United States in 1882 at $2,768,682 less than Mr. Burchard. The New York "Mining Record" insists that the world's production of gold in 1882 did not exceed $90,000,000, the difference between the "Record" and other authorities being most marked in respect to the yield of the Russian mines. Without claiming exact correctness, the total gold yield of the world may be approximately stated at $100,000,000. Of this total production of gold, the arts and manufactures swallow up fully five-sixths, and this consumption, being almost wholly for objects of luxury and display, must increase in about the ratio in which wealth increases.

The consumption of gold for other than monetary purposes in Europe, America, and Australia has more than quadrupled in thirty years, and has quite trebled in twenty years. It is more than five times what it was half a century ago. The great mass of gold which has flowed from the mines has been absorbed in the same opulence and luxury of the times which have swallowed up the flood of gems, great in volume beyond any former precedent, from the diamond fields of South Africa, and increasing prices will be quite as likely to whet the appetite for both as to check it. Five-sixths of the current production of gold is absorbed in the arts and manufactures, in the western world and in British India. A part of the remaining sixth is lost in the wear of coins and by fires, shipwrecks, and forgotten hoards. What is left to increase the stock of gold money in proportion to the increase of population, exchanges, and wealth of the world? It is possible that the production of gold may increase. It is also possible that it may decrease, as it actually has been decreasing for many years; but there is no uncertainty about the consumption of gold, which is sure to grow *pari passu* with the growing

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

opulence and luxury of the world. It has trebled within the past twenty years, and if it only doubles within the next twenty years it will exceed the production, even at the extreme rate which it attained when the California and Australia out-turn was at its highest point.

All the conditions have changed since the commencement of the agitation for a single metallic standard. There was then a greater production of gold, and a very much less consumption for other than monetary purposes, and it is not strange that many persons honestly believed that the steadiness of prices could be best secured by confining the functions of money to gold alone. But it is difficult to understand how it can now be believed, under the complete change of circumstances, that a perseverance in that policy can have any other result than a prostration in the prices of every species of property and in the wages of labor, and the serious injury of all indebted persons, classes, and nations. Although the disasters which are sure to follow from this policy will fall most heavily upon the debtor classes, and creditors and money capitalists may derive a temporary advantage, they cannot in the end escape a participation in the evil results. In a general wreck all must suffer, although in different degrees.

The conditions, it must be admitted, are modified where creditors and debtors do not live in the same country. The London "Economist" of April 21, 1883, closes its comments upon Mr. Goschen's address by saying:

> "There is some consolation to us in the fact to which he directs special attention: that any increase in the purchasing power of gold is a benefit to creditors. Nearly every nation on the face of the earth is indebted to us, and the result of an appreciation of gold is, that we obtain a larger quantity of their commodities in settlement of our claims."

This view of the "Economist" is one of the explanations of the support given to gold mono-metallism by classes which are powerful and, perhaps, dominant in some other countries of western Europe besides Great Britain. It shows how idle the suggestion is, that we can force the English and similarly situated nations into bi-metallism by again demonetizing silver ourselves, and thereby precipitating a still further decline in prices. Such a decline is precisely the object which, as international creditors, they desire. We know by an experience too fresh to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be forgotten, that when the depression of 1878–9 was at its worst, the adherence of the governing classes in England and Germany to a gold standard only became more determined and aggressive.

It is not by coöperating with them, but by resisting and defeating their scheme of dislodging silver from its immemorial place as one of the money metals of the world that we shall compel them to abandon it. The present and prospective position of the United States is so strong, and silver is now the favorite currency of so large a part of mankind, that gold cannot be made the exclusive money of the world without our consent. In 1900, we shall have more population and more wealth than Great Britain and Germany combined. We have only to remain firm in our present position. Europeans are too dependent upon foreign trade, and have too much fear of the United States, as a commercial rival, to persevere in a gold policy which would tend to isolate them if we refused to join them in it. We cannot bring upon them the coercive power of low prices without submitting ourselves to the same prices and to all the ruinous consequences which they entail. The success of that species of coercion is, to say the least, too doubtful to justify the enormous sacrifices on our own part which a trial of it must involve.

N. P. Hill.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOME ASPECTS OF DEMOCRACY IN ENGLAND.

First. To democracy in England may be applied a celebrated phrase, in a sense different from that in which it was used by its author. The English democracy "reigns but does not govern."

Under the constitution of modern England the people are sovereign, for any change which a decided majority of the nation had at heart would be rapidly effected, and effected by legal means. Convince, say, two-thirds of the people that the State Church, the House of Lords, or the Crown, ought to be abolished, and the ecclesiastical system, the peerage, the monarchy itself, would be put an end to by the same legal and regular means as the process which brought about the disestablishment of the Irish Church. That the will of the people could, even in such extreme cases as those I have imagined, be carried into effect by legal means and without revolutionary violence is, if not absolutely certain, yet in the very highest degree probable. What no sane man can doubt is that in the long run the course of domestic and of foreign policy, the fate of every political party, the success or failure of every leading statesman, depends upon the predominant wish of the people, whenever such predominant wish in reality exists. The utter absence in England of popular violence is in fact a tribute to popular power. Crowds do not fight in the streets for objects they can obtain by casting votes into the ballot-boxes, and an even stronger proof of popular supremacy than the orderliness of the multitude is found in the spirit of compliance with public opinion displayed by politicians of every political hue. The contest which ended with the first Reform Bill determined, once for all, that the stanchest Tories were not prepared to attempt a policy of reaction; the history of the last twenty years proves that modern Conservatives dare not pursue a policy of re-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sistance. There is no reason to suppose that the statesmen of to-day are men of less courage or of lower tone than their fathers. The difference is that modern politicians tacitly recognize the advent to power of a new sovereign. They yield, as politicians of all ages have yielded, to the will of the person, or persons, who can be felt to represent the force of the nation. The difference between the statesmen of 1783 and the statesmen of 1883 is that North, Fox, or Pitt, and hundreds of men inferior to them, saw in the Crown, in Parliament, and in the limited bodies whom Parliament represented, the supreme power which ruled, and had a right to rule, the country. Gladstone, Lord Hartington, and Lord Salisbury recognize, with more or less distinctness, that the majority of the electors are the true masters of England. The sovereignty of the people, if a doctrine still denied in theory, has become in practice a fundamental dogma of English constitutionalism. A minister may serve his sovereign basely. The heroes who repelled the armada played a very sorry part as courtiers and flatterers of Elizabeth. In like manner, modern statesmen are prone enough to lose all sense of dignity in flattering the sovereign people. But there is no more essential baseness in an English minister's recognizing that the people are king than there is in the deference paid by a German minister to the undoubted power of the German emperor. Statesmen in all ages must recognize their true sovereign. The whole attitude of English politicians proves that the English democracy has begun to reign, though the power of the democracy is in the nineteenth century as carefully masked under the forms of the monarchy as in the eighteenth century was the power of the aristocracy.

But the democracy which has begun to reign assuredly does not, as yet, and perhaps never will, govern. The constitution is not "democratic" in the sense in which that term is applied to the political arrangements of France, of Switzerland, or of the United States. The so-called democracy of the United Kingdom consists of less than four million electors, selected out of a population of more than thirty-five million. This limited electorate does not include the poorest classes; and the inequality of electoral districts, the distribution of parliamentary seats, the difference between the borough and the county franchise, the existence of the House of Lords, and a hundred other constitutional checks, visible and invisible, counterbalance or neutralize

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the theoretical supremacy of the constituencies. If you look not at the letter but at the working of the constitution, you feel inclined to conclude that still further limitations must be placed on the sense in which English institutions can be called democratic. The well-to-do, the rich, the noble, are still, as they always have been, the governing classes in England. The cabinet contains seven peers; the commoners who have seats in it are, from the premier downward, for the most part men of wealth, and, with very few exceptions, belong to the upper portion of gentlemanlike society. Nothing is more absurd, and nothing at the same time is more instructive, than the outcry raised among Conservatives at the real or supposed influence of Mr. Chamberlain. The entrance into the cabinet of a wealthy manufacturer, and the most distinguished public man in a city like Birmingham, excites in some circles, if I may venture to judge from the tone of the Conservative prints, a good deal more horror than would be aroused in France by the nomination as premier of the reddest Republican who sits in the French Assembly. The horror is no doubt partly factitious. I have lived long enough to remember the day when Mr. Bright was denounced as a demagogue who set class against class, and was ready to advocate an agrarian law. A little knowledge of modern history makes one aware of the fact that not more than fifty years ago Lord Grey, Lord John Russell, and Lord Brougham were denounced as revolutionists, prepared to undermine the constitution.

But that people should even pretend to stand aghast at the increasing influence of "Joe" Chamberlain proves that if England has a democratic constitution it is not as yet a democratic country, and the writers or politicians who rhetorically tremble at the unaristocratic antecedents and the revolutionary schemes of Mr. Chamberlain probably know their trade. The mass of the electors like to be led by rich men and lords. There is something far more curious than admirable in the delight displayed by every section of the Liberal party at the tardy and incomplete conversion of Lord Derby to the dogmas of Liberalism. It is impossible not to conjecture that English workingmen, like other classes of their countrymen, are a good deal influenced by their trust in money and love of rank, which lies very near to the vice of snobbishness — a vice, it may be added, which, if it lowers the character of the nation, probably contributes to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

safety of the state. However this may be, what is certain is that artisans do not wish to be represented in Parliament by their fellows. Not more than three or, at most, four men who can in any sense of the term be called artisans have seats in the House of Commons; and if Mr. Bradlaugh is to be counted among the representatives of the laboring classes, he still stands for all the zeal of the Northampton shoemakers, shivering outside in the cold. This fact is instructive in more ways than one. It suggests a conclusion which is confirmed by many of the smaller and familiar traits of English life, namely, that however democratic may be some parts of the English constitution, the spirit of democracy has as yet not pervaded English society. The working classes, in the towns at least, have obtained full political rights; it is doubtful whether they themselves recognize or try to establish that ideal of social equality which exerts a profound influence on the democracy of France. Privilege and personal liberty (notions closely connected together) are the ideas which have hitherto characterized the whole development of the English people, and it is by no means certain that conceptions engendered by aristocratic government have not been inherited by the English democracy.

Second. Democracy in England is an enigma, so to speak, both to its leaders and to itself.

Modern statesmen, at any rate in England, recognize the sovereignty of the people; they honestly wish to govern in accordance with the will of their sovereign; they all avow implicit deference to public opinion. Their main difficulty is that, on many points they neither know nor even can conjecture what is the opinion of the people. What, for example, is the genuine opinion of the "nation"—by which term I mean a distinct majority among the electors—as to the questions in which politics trench on the domain of religion? The matter is one on which men of equal judgment and of equal information arrive at opposite conclusions. Listen to Mr. Bright, and you will believe that the people long for the disestablishment of the Church; read the "National Reformer," and you will infer that the working classes are zealous secularists. Churchmen, on the other hand, are convinced—and not without some apparent reasons to allege for their conviction—that the Church of England is each day obtaining increased influence; and Mr. M'Call informs the world that the only way to keep the working classes from

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

demanding a redistribution of property is to allow full scope to the vagaries or principles of Ritualist clergymen.

Where experts differ, a plain man who can pretend to no private or special knowledge of popular sentiment may well hesitate to pronounce any decisive opinion. The only point about which a fair critic can feel certain is that the guides or exponents of popular opinion are, for the most part, in the dark as to what that opinion may be on matters involving religious or theological considerations. What, again, is the opinion of the nation about peace and war? Lord Beaconsfield was certainly not a fool. He was free from prejudices. During a large part of his career he was quite prepared to ally himself with the Manchester school, or, indeed, with any school or party likely to represent the spirit of the time. His lordship certainly came to the conclusion that the English people were prepared to support schemes of aggressive imperialism; he supposed that an exaggerated parody of the policy of Palmerston would win the applause of democratic constituencies. His error, I shall be told, led his party to political ruin, and has been finally exposed. The nation preferred Mr. Gladstone's sermons to Lord Beaconsfield's bluster, and, instead of listening to Jingo songs at the music halls, filled the meeting-houses to hear addresses on the blessings of peace and the iniquity of war.

The Liberal triumph of 1880 was no doubt an impressive fact (as, by the way, was also the Conservative triumph of 1874); it certainly suggested the idea that the doctrines of Mr. Cobden had been adopted by the nation, and that all Englishmen were prepared to become members of the Anti-Aggression League. But the inferences suggested by the result of the campaign in Midlothian are hardly borne out by the effect on public sentiment of the campaign in Egypt. The electors who applauded Mr. Gladstone when he denounced the invasion of Afghanistan heard with apparent pleasure of the bombardment of Alexandria, took with perfect indifference the retirement from the cabinet of the one member who really advocated the principles of the Peace Society, and would, it may reasonably be supposed, not be much perturbed if the conquest were to end in the annexation of Egypt. I have no wish to blame the Egyptian policy of the Government; it admits, I think, of fair apology. The only point on which I am concerned to insist is, that the way in which that policy has been received by the elect-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ors makes it impossible to conjecture what is the opinion of the people on matters of peace or war.

What, lastly, is the true sentiment of English electors with regard to the government of Ireland? Are they profoundly indignant at Irish crime and lawlessness, or do they, on the whole, think that Ireland ought to be left to the Irish, and that the demand for home rule is not unreasonable? Here, as on other points, politicians are in the dark. When Lord Palmerston was told that an extension of the franchise would not alter the class of persons elected members of Parliament, he replied, it is said: "Yes, the players will be the same, but they will play not to the pit or boxes, but to the gallery." The dictum cuts far deeper than most of the few sayings attributed to his lordship. What neither Palmerston nor any other prophet anticipated was that the players would be at fault for want of knowing what were the tunes with which the gallery would be pleased. Half the hesitations of English statesmenship are due not to cowardice, but to ignorance. They are ministers of the democracy, and they cannot tell for certain what are the wishes of their monarch.

English democracy is at present a puzzle to itself no less than to its leaders. The whole course, indeed, of popular government rests on the assumption that about every leading question of the day a definite "public opinion" exists; or, in other words, that a large majority of the nation have a decided view, one way or another, upon all the great issues which are the topics of political controversy. Every sensible person knows that this assumption is, to a certain extent, fictitious. On many matters of very high importance the mass of the electors never form, nor can form, any decided judgment whatever. The most which can be expected of them is that they should decide who are the persons by whom such matters as, for example, the right mode of recruiting for the army, the best methods of administering the national finance, and the like, are to be determined. But what seems to have escaped the notice of theorists and politicians is, that the more democratic a country becomes, and the greater, therefore, the importance of public opinion, the more likely it is that on subjects even of supreme consequence no real public opinion should, in fact, exist. This is, I suspect, constantly the true state of things in modern England. The majority of the electors have, on many topics, no opinion what-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ever. They may be prepared to distrust Lord Salisbury or to trust Mr. Gladstone; they may have perfectly adequate grounds for this sentiment of confidence or suspicion. But on the definite question whether the English army should be kept for years in Egypt, whether Austria ought to be bidden to keep her hands off Bosnia, they may well entertain no decided or predominant conviction whatever. This, of course, is not invariably the case. The experience both of England, and I conceive of the United States, shows conclusively that the people do occasionally, and especially on broad matters of opinion which appeal to strong feelings, make up their mind with a decision and emphasis which throws out all calculations of politicians. But the existence of a definite predominant public opinion is likely to become more and more the exception, not the rule. As things at present stand, English democracy is a puzzle to itself, because it does not know its own mind, or, to speak plainly, because it does not possess one mind which can be known.

Third. A prudent critic, who has realized the difficulty of our topic and the extreme doubtfulness of all dogmatic assertions as to the permanent characteristics of such a body as the democracy of England, will confine himself as far as possible to noting "tendencies." It is quite possible to assert, with some confidence, that bodies of persons tend to act in a certain manner, when it would be most unwise to assert that they always will, or necessarily must, act in the manner indicated. Of the tendencies which, judging by the experience of the last fifteen years, are exhibited by the people of England, or, in other words, by the majority of the English electors, three are specially noteworthy.

The electors are apt to be guided rather by their confidence, or want of confidence, in men than by their opinion as to measures. No one, whatever his own political bias, can doubt that, in different ways, the personality both of Lord Beaconsfield and of Mr. Gladstone has told to an extraordinary extent on the course of politics. His lordship, with all his skill, talent, or genius, never possessed the art of gaining popular confidence. He could not, like Palmerston, enlist in his favor the ordinary every-day feelings of commonplace Englishmen. He could not, like Mr. Gladstone, evoke the moral feeling of the masses and appeal to the morality or the sentiment of the crowd. The indignation at Bulgarian atrocities was aroused quite as much by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the cynical indifference of the premier as by the cruelty of the Turks. Lord Beaconsfield, without knowing it, served the cause of Russia quite as effectively as did Mr. Gladstone. His lordship's personal character influenced the crowd by way of repulsion. Of the force exerted by Mr. Gladstone on the ordinary electors by way of attraction, one can hardly speak in too strong terms. The very qualities which repel a good number of so-called educated Liberals conciliated the men who, in 1880, crowded to the ballot-boxes. There is something worse than childish in the attitude of critics who, before the elections began, described Mr. Gladstone as little better than a raving maniac, and who, when the elections proved that this madman really understood the people of England, will not admit the immense influence exercised by Mr. Gladstone's personal talents and genius.

The electors again exhibit an almost unmistakable tendency (traceable, as it seems to me, also among the citizens of America) to be swayed far more strongly by appeals to feeling than by appeals to considerations of interest or of policy. The whole Midlothian campaign is, of course, one example of this tendency; but it is by no means the only example. We may deplore or may admire the disposition to be moved by appeals to moral feeling, but that this disposition exists throughout the majority of the population, both in England and in America, appears to me hardly to admit of doubt. Certainly all agitators or reformers act on the supposition that the people are more easily moved by an appeal to the heart than to the head. Mr. Plimsoll's plans were assuredly marked by more benevolence than wisdom. Mr. Plimsoll, going nearly out of his mind on the floor of the House under the pressure of philanthropic excitement, was hardly a sight to kindle the sympathy of statesmen. But Mr. Plimsoll, just because of his benevolent excitability, became for a time a sort of power in the state; and Mr. Plimsoll's ideas are a typical instance of the kind of policy which gains success by its appeal to genuine popular benevolence and to the far less respectable popular superstition that benevolent objects can always be secured by the interference of the state. There is a close connection between the tendency of a democratic society to be swayed by its feelings and the equally marked tendency of such a society to rely on the effectiveness of state inspection and interference for the protection of classes who are, or seem to be, unable to protect themselves.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Nothing, lastly, can be more remarkable than the calmness exhibited by the democracy of England under what might appear to be great provocation. The whole course of Irish affairs, since the present ministry came into power, has been calculated to provoke English Liberals. All English and Scotch business has been postponed for the sake of remedying Irish grievances. The Land Act, and measures connected with the Land Act, have occupied the whole time of Parliament, and nothing or little has been done to meet the wishes of English electors. What is worse than this, the attempt to remove or lessen the grievances of Ireland has frittered away the energy, the prestige, and the power of the Liberal party, and to the ordinary elector, at any rate, it may well seem that the sacrifices made in order to content Ireland have all been made in vain. As one Conservative orator after another has, in effect, pressed upon the public, supposed concessions to justice have only fostered discontent, and a message of conciliation has been answered by outrage and assassination, yet the English electors have, as far as their acts can show, kept perfectly calm. The tragedy of the Phœnix Park provoked no outburst of popular anger. The so-called "Kilmainham Treaty," which, though one of the wisest strokes of policy ever attempted by an enlightened ministry, was naturally offensive to popular sentiment, has been the theme of much Tory invective, but has not stirred the masses. The attitude of the democracy is no doubt capable of different interpretations. Liberty, and the habit of public discussion, may at last have produced a condition of general reasonableness utterly opposed to violent outbursts of passion. It is possible, on the other hand, that a crowd of electors, occupied in the daily struggles of life, and only on rare occasions interested in questions of policy, may feel far less keenly on matters of national interest than did the smaller constituencies who, fifty years ago, withdrew their confidence from the Whigs because the Whigs were supposed to be in alliance with O'Connell. Whatever may be the true explanation of the attitude taken up by the English people about Ireland, the fact is certainly noticeable that O'Connell, who was assuredly loyal to the Crown, who wished to act in harmony with the English Liberal leaders, and who strove to keep the agitation for repeal within the strict limits of law, excited in his generation tenfold the hatred which has in the present day been aroused by Mr. Parnell, whose schemes of home rule necessarily tend to the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

absolute independence of Ireland, who has thwarted every liberal effort to conciliate the Irish people, and who has certainly not been able to keep his followers within the bounds of the law. Here, as elsewhere, what be the true sentiment of the English democracy is to a certain extent an enigma.

One remark ought to modify every theory or observation as to the English people under the influence of more or less democratic institutions. It is, that the permanent historical characteristics of Englishmen are of far more importance than any which may be produced by the gradual change of political and social institutions. There is no reason to believe that English democrats, even should the democracy become completely supreme in the state, will be found, for good or bad, to differ essentially from Englishmen who are not democrats. If this be so, the further inference may safely be drawn that in one shape or another Conservatism of some sort, a tendency to keep things as they are, an adherence to rather commonplace notions found to be in conformity with common sense, will be a characteristic of democratic, as it has been of monarchical or aristocratic England.

A. V. DICEY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

COÖPERATIVE DISTRIBUTION.

THE story of Coöperative Distribution in the United States opens in the decade 1830–40. The New England Association of Farmers and Mechanics, which held its first convention in February, 1831, was apparently the earliest organization to introduce and discuss resolutions upon this subject. The topic was agitated in different labor organizations in that decade, and some stores were started. These early experiments soon disappeared, leaving no accessible records behind them. In October, 1845, a dozen persons opened a store in an upper chamber over the Boylston Market, Boston. Its first purchases were a box of soap and a half chest of tea. Out of this little germ grew an enterprise that, in its best days, carried on a trade of from $1,000,000 to $2,000,000 per annum. The store was started by members of The Workingmen's Protective Union. The local divisions formed branches of a central supply agency. The trade of the association was reported as follows: 1848, $112,507.79; 1849, $220,801.60; 1850, $535,338.56. In 1849 its name was changed to the New England Protective Union. An analysis of the returns to the Central Division for the year ending December 31, 1850, shows the number of divisions to have been 106, 83 of which returned a membership of 5109, while 84 returned a capital of $71,890.36. The highest amount held by any one division was $2765.51, the lowest being $150, averaging thus $855.63. For the succeeding quarter, 67 divisions reported having purchased through the central agency to the extent of $102,341.04, an average of $1527.47. The largest trade made at this time by one division was by No. 55, of New Bedford, which in 1849 made a total sale of $31,278.64. The amount purchased through the agency in nine months of 1851 was $619,633.16. By October, 1852, the number of divisions had

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

grown to 403, of which 167 reported an aggregate capital of $241,712.66, and of which 165 divisions gave an aggregate of sales for the year of $1,696,825.46.

Discord finally split the organization. The new branch took the name of The American Protective Union. The old organization showed, in 1855, 72 divisions reporting, with 4527 members, an aggregate business of $1,130,719.29. The decline set in the next year. The new branch did a business, between 1853 and 1858, ranging from $1,000,000 to $1,536,000 per annum. In 1859, the board of government believed that there were 600 stores in operation. By this time the decline had begun in this branch also. The aggregate business for 1859 was only $930,376.36. Both branches were soon practically defunct. The great majority of the local stores were gradually wound up, or passed into ordinary joint-stock concerns or into private hands. The civil war put an end to most of the few that lingered on that far. A handful endured even that strain, and some live still, under new names generally; *e. g.*, the stores in Worcester, New Bedford, Natick, etc. The Natick store presents a fine example of fidelity to true coöperative principles and of continued prosperity. It has been now in existence for twenty-two years. Its semi-annual dividends have always been ready promptly. The capital stock, originally fixed at $2000, has been raised to $6000. It is held now by 564 members in $10 shares. Its last report (Dec. 30, 1882) shows sales for the year of $129,265, from which there were net profits of $2298, a return of $3.60 on each share of $10. Of experiments outside of Massachusetts during the period before the civil war no reliable data are at hand.

Fincher's "Trade Review" recorded the renewed interest that showed itself in many quarters in the opening of the decade 1860–70. It gave accounts of meetings held to agitate the subject, of calls for information, for lectures, etc. It noted, between November, 1863, and May, 1866, the establishment of thirty-six stores in ten States. A number of other stores were mentioned as projected. The extent of this movement we may better judge from the fact that the "Review" noticed a conference of coöperative stores in Boston, wherein a plan for a wholesale store was recommended, and a contemplated conference of the stores in New York State. Some of these stores started off with great encouragement. The Providence store made sales of $1200 in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the first week, and of $1500 in the second week, and the sales rose within six months to as high as $600 a day. The Troy store sold to the extent of $5000 in the first two weeks. The Roxbury and Charlestown stores even reported sales of $6000 each in the first week. Cheering tidings of progress were noted from time to time in the "Trade Review." The South Reading store reported for the ninth quarter sales of $11,801.25. The Troy store made sales in its first six months of $36,825.43. The Chelsea store claimed sales in its first year of $90,000.

Alongside of these signs of success appear brief records of stores that had failed. The "Review's" chronicle closes in May, 1866, the paper then going out of existence, and we lose our only general guide for this period. We find, however, scattered local data, indicating a continuance of the movement. Massachusetts reported, officially, in 1868, the existence of twelve distributive associations in eleven towns. Their united capital amounted to $47,000, and the aggregate membership to 1859. Other stores followed in the same State. Sporadic developments of stores appear to have taken place through the country. Some of them have continued in operation to the present time and have won notable successes. The First Worcester Coöperative Grocery and Provision Store was organized in 1867. In 1875 it reported 590 members, and an annual sale of $75,000. In 1881 it reported a paid-up capital of $5000, with reserves of $1113. The Acushnet Coöperative Association was organized for the sale of groceries in 1867. It reported, in 1875, a membership of 100, a share-capital of $6900, in shares of twenty-five dollars, assets amounting to $13,622, an annual trade of $71,000, and a dividend of about thirty-two per cent. on the members' capital. During the three years ending with 1874 the association paid dividends amounting to 240 per cent. on its share-capital.

The Fall River Workingmen's Coöperative Association was organized in 1866 as a joint-stock company. After about three years' experience, it re-organized on the Rochdale plan. At the close of its first year it had sixty-five members and a share-capital of $3600. By the close of 1874 its membership had increased to 260, and the share-capital to $19,734, while its assets were about $50,000. During 1874 its sales were $79,615, and its net profits for the year were $9155. In the eight years of its existence up to 1875, the store had sold goods to the value of $425,277; had paid to members, as interest and dividends, $38,179; and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

had divided among purchasers, not members, $4757. In 1881 the association reported a paid-up capital of $17,381.

Under the pressure of the hard times in the next decade (1870–80), the Order of the Patrons of Husbandry (founded in 1867) took on large proportions. In six months of 1873 more than 10,000 granges were formed. The membership doubled in 1874. At the meeting of the National Grange, in November, 1875, the secretary reported 24,290 granges, with a membership of 763,263. The minutes of the National Grange show from the start a discussion of various schemes of coöperation, with references to experiments actually made. The favorite method was an imperfect form of coöperation, in which each local grange resolved itself into a purchasing club, and the various granges of a State united to support a general agent, who, combining the orders of the scattered clubs, bought in large quantities at a considerable discount, and shipped by car-load to the several granges at reduced rates. The business of these agencies became immense. Pennsylvania had an agency-store in Philadelphia filled from top to bottom with samples. The Ohio agency, in one year (1875), ran a business of a few thousand dollars to "not far from one million," with a saving to the granges of $240,725.40.

The "Economist" of November 8, 1876, declared that "their records show twenty State purchasing agencies, three of which do each an annual business of $200,000, and one of which does an annual business of $1,000,000. Patrons have five steam-boat or packet lines, fifty societies for shipping goods, thirty-two grain elevators, twenty-two warehouses for storing goods." Some of the grange organs made huge claims as to the savings thus effected. "The P. of H. saved $5,000,000 in 1872 and $12,000,000 in 1874." This system of State agencies assumed proportions beyond the business talent and experience the Order could furnish, and great losses ensued.

The attention of the Order was drawn to purer forms of coöperation. The subject of local stores was discussed at great length. The ninth session of the National Grange (1875) presented a careful plan of organizing such stores, conforming in essential particulars to the Rochdale model. This was widely scattered through the Order, and, it is believed, was generally followed in the experiments made. Unfortunately, there are in print no accurate accounts of the spread of these stores and of their experiences. The "Economist," in 1876, declared: "It is quite

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

impossible to enumerate the grange stores, but one hundred and sixty are recorded." The official records of the National Grange use only general language: "Local stores are in successful operation all over the country" (1879). "There are large numbers of coöperative associations in various sections of the country. . . . Some have succeeded beyond the most sanguine expectations of those interested in them; others have failed" (1881).

Educational influences were contemplated and secured in these coöperative associations. The local granges met statedly, often in their own halls, to discuss economic and other questions. They established circulating libraries and schools of agriculture.

The reaction usual to all rapidly developing movements befell this Order in the latter part of the decade, aggravated by the relaxing effects of returning national prosperity. Of late, however, there appears to be a revival in the Order.

A second great organization furthering coöperation arose in 1874—the Sovereigns of Industry. This was a secret Order, with ritual, etc., open to all classes except lawyers.* The preamble to the constitution of the National Council stated its object thus:

> "It will try to establish a better system of economical exchanges, and to promote, on a basis of equity and liberty, mutual fellowship and coöperative action among the producers and consumers of wealth."

The growth of the Order was rapid. Within forty days from the organization, councils were formed in eighteen States. At the first annual meeting of the Massachusetts Council (December, 1874), one hundred councils were represented, with ten thousand members. The second annual council reported one hundred and sixty-six councils with twenty thousand members. In 1877, the National Council had reports from councils in seventeen States and territories. At first the members of a local council used to club together in buying at a certain store, saving thus from ten to twenty per cent. They would buy flour by the carload, saving from two to three dollars a barrel. A general distributing agency was established in Chicago, through which all local councils could procure goods direct at cost. The General Council urged upon the Order the establishment of coöperative

* It is a notable fact that both of these Orders were open to women, and that the S. of I. made women eligible to every position in their ranks; some of the councils electing women as presidents.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stores upon the Rochdale system, and clearly and accurately enunciated the principles and methods of that system in a plan printed for free distribution. The advice seems to have been widely followed. The report of the Committee on Methods of Trade reported fifty stores in Massachusetts in 1875. The "Sovereigns' Bulletin" of May, 1875, mentions that "within the past few months a large number of coöperative stores have been started by members of the Order in many different States."

By 1877 the number of stores reporting to the Massachusetts Council had fallen to twenty-nine, fifteen of which were joint-stock companies and fourteen of which were carried on upon the Rochdale plan, with total sales per month of $49,806. There were eight stores not reporting to the council. The address of President W. H. Earle to the National Council in Syracuse, March 20, 1877, said:

> "Ninety-four (94) councils, selected from the whole, report a membership of 7273, and with an average capital of only $884 did a business last year of $1,089,372.55. This was equal to a saving of $21 to every man and woman belonging to these councils. It is safe to assume that the unreported sales will swell the amount to at least $3,000,000, which, at the same ratio of profit as above reported, would make a saving of $420,000."

The president's address to the fourth annual council (1878) presented returns from seventy-five stores. Forty-five councils reported an aggregate trade for the year of $750,000; while thirty-five councils reported capital in the stores they represented of $58,000. It was proposed at this time to create a coöperative exchange, under the title of The New England Sovereigns of Industry Board of Trade, to promote direct coöperative trade or exchange.

Ten of the leading stores reporting to the Order showed an average capital of $2630, with an average trade of $34,000. "It is worthy of note," says the address, "that all these stores have conducted their business upon the Rochdale plan." The address further stated that "nearly the entire trade reported has been conducted on the Rochdale plan." Some of these stores have continued prospering to the present time. The Silver Lake Coöperative Association commenced business in July, 1875, with a capital of only $430. In 1877 it had a capital of $1200, and did a business per annum of about $15,000. Its expenses, all told, were about $912 a year. In 1881 its paid-up capital was $1770;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sales not reported. The Old Colony Coöperative Association, Kingston village, opened its store in 1875, and in 1877 was doing business at the rate of about $30,000 per annum. It reported for 1881 a paid-up capital of $4680, with a balance of profits of $419. The Saxonville store was, in 1877, doing business to the amount of $48,000 per annum, on a capital of $1700.

In 1878 the Order was considering larger plans, *e. g.*, a wholesale store, a warehouse, etc. But soon after this serious troubles were experienced in the Order, whose nature is only partially divulged in the reports of its councils and the columns of its organs. All other sources of trouble were aggravated by the relaxing of the pressure of hard times that had forced men into combination. The founder and chief leader of the Order seems to have labored heroically, in a thoroughly religious spirit — but in vain. In April, 1880, the "Sovereigns' Bulletin" noticed a meeting of the Executive Committee of the National Council, which would "probably take some final and definite action as to the Order." There is no record of the funeral.

In addition to these organized movements to build up coöperative distribution, there have been, from 1870 onward, numerous stores springing into being, from purely local interest. Massachusetts reported, from the best information to be procured, in 1875, fifteen independent stores as having been organized since 1870, with an aggregate capital of $29,260; and twenty such stores as then in operation, with a capital of $67,351. This shows that five stores had lived on from the preceding decade, averaging a capital of over $7500. In addition, there were several societies mentioned as not reporting to the State. Eight societies, reporting officially to the Labor Bureau, gave aggregate sales of $500,000 per annum.

In New York State we find both failures and successes during this period. Two of the latter may be noted. The Farmers' and Mechanics' Trading Company, Seneca Falls, was founded in 1872, and re-organized in 1878. Its tenth annual report (Dec. 31, 1882) shows sales for the year of $13,386.97, an increase of over $1500 upon the preceding year. The net profits for the year were $721.62. It has already paid in dividends more than the amount of capital invested in 1872, and the undivided profits are now equal to the sum of eighty per centum in excess of the capital still remaining invested in the business. The Port Jervis Coöperative Association, founded in 1878, in its seven-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

teenth quarterly report (March, 1882) shows sales during the quarter of $10,500, being an increase of $2000 upon the same quarter of the previous year. It declared an annual dividend of six per cent. on the stock and of three per cent. to all purchasers. The profit accruing to the reserve fund amounted to $120. The association was at this time considering propositions to buy a central lot and build a store thereon, and to connect the present store with various points in the suburbs by telephone.

New Jersey had a number of stores started in this period, details of which the Labor Bureau finds it hard to get at. The Raritan Woolen Mills Coöperative Association, one of the most successful ventures in the State, it is believed, was organized with a capital of $2810, and has now a capital of over $9670. The sales for the year ending October 8, 1880, were $95,821.39, and for the six months ending April 8, 1881, were $54,590.45, or over $9000 per month. Ten per cent. has been paid on the capital stock and from five to six per cent. on the purchases. Ohio gave birth to a number of experiments in this decade. Accounts are had of eight stores in 1877. Their sales ranged from $2500 to $66,000 per annum, and their net profits from $170 to $6300 per annum. In Pennsylvania two examples of successful stores may be taken from the extreme sections of the State. The Neshannock Coöperative Society, Neshannock Falls, Lawrence County, was founded early in 1874. Its thirty-fifth quarterly report (January 31, 1882) shows sales for the quarter of $10,307.53, with profits of $1057.85.

The most brilliant success achieved in the country has been won by the Philadelphia Industrial Coöperative Society (limited). It was incorporated in 1875. Starting with one store, it has now six stores: a main store, a store for boots and shoes, one for meats and provisions, one for dry goods, and two branch stores. Its first quarter's sales were about $2600. Its sales for the quarter ending February 18, 1882, were $51,413.63, being an increase upon the preceding quarter of over $11,000. The gross profits for the quarter were $4516.52, which, after paying the usual claims of share-capital, fixed stock, and legal reserve, and four per cent. on non-members' purchases, enabled the society to pay a dividend on members' purchases of nine per cent., and still left a small balance. There are now upward of a thousand members.

There have been some curious phases of coöperative distribution. The dividing stores of Fall River bade fair at one time to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

create a clearly marked species. The earliest opened was in 1865, in a wooden shed owned by a mill corporation. By 1874 there were 34 such stores. The number of families represented at this time was about 1200. These stores did not cherish any of the nobler sentiments which animated the Rochdale weavers, nor did they embody the practical wisdom of those sagacious Yorkshiremen. They seem to have sold as near cost as possible, and to have had no educational or other fund. The saving effected was not made plain to all the members, as is done where the usual prices are followed, and the profits are set aside as dividends. So when, in 1874, a strong firm of grocers from Boston opened a branch in Fall River, their low rates cut out most of the dividing stores. There are now seven of them in existence, representing a membership of about 1200 persons. There is in Philadelphia a store started, built up, and chiefly managed by women. A small number of women, three winters ago, bought their groceries together at wholesale — barrels of flour, chests of tea, bags of coffee, etc.— and distributed them among themselves. They were so well pleased with the experiment that they formed a Working People's Coöperative Association, with shares at $2 each. They have opened a store on Mondays, Wednesdays, and Saturdays, from 7 to 10 P. M., when one of the women is in charge. Shares have been reduced to $1 apiece. A small profit is charged for rent and other expenses. There was a store in Springfield, Ohio, early in the decade 1870–80, whose membership was confined to colored people.

A renewed activity in coöperative distribution marks the current decade. Stores are reported as starting up in many sections of the country: four in New Jersey, four in Pennsylvania, seven in Michigan, etc. Even distant Montana is stirring itself. Some of these new societies start off vigorously. The Dorchester store (organized 1880) reported sales for 1881 of $30,000. The Lansing (Mich.) store began in a small way with a paid-up capital of only $300, and is now doing a business of upward of $32,000 per annum. Troy (N. Y.) has lately opened a store with a fine spirit of determination on the part of one or two members — young men who have been several times disappointed already, but are resolved to make a success of this venture by shouldering the chief labor of it. Another instance of the same determined spirit —to which coöperation has always owed its successes—is found in Springfield, Ohio, where, after repeated failures, a new store is

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

about to be started through the agency of a few sturdy souls. As already indicated, the Patrons of Husbandry seem to be reviving, and in the new impetus of this Order coöperation is sharing.

The late secretary of the National Grange writes: "Hundreds of coöperative stores upon the Rochdale plan are in successful operation all over the country, while a number of large wholesale or supply houses are running at various centers." That this is no empty boast is evidenced by the official reports from one State, and that a frontier State. The Texas Coöperative Association, Patrons of Husbandry, in its third annual report (July, 1881), gives seventy-five coöperative granges as connected with it. The general manager reports (May, 1882) 103 distributive associations. He writes: "Our growth has astonished all alike. We have not had a single failure where the true Rochdale principles have been adhered to." The secretary writes (April, 1882): "The business is a wonderful success thus far."

Two new labor organizations have come to the front with the present decade, each of which emphasizes coöperation. The Central Labor Union, a federative body of the trade associations of New York City, in its first semi-annual report (July, 1882) presents coöperation as one of its chief aims. The Knights of Labor, the newest national order, seeks, according to the fourth plank in its declaration of principles, "the establishment of coöperative institutions, productive and distributive." The claim this Order makes as to membership warrants the hope that if it seriously essays to embody this principle, something substantial may result to the cause of coöperation.

This bird's-eye view of the story of coöperative distribution in the United States shows a very much larger development than is usually supposed. Owing to the obscurity incident to these humble enterprises, their shrinking from public notice and the ephemeral character of many of them, data are peculiarly hard to gather; so that the probability is that the real extent of this movement is very imperfectly indicated in this paper. Most of the experiments have undoubtedly been failures. The causes of this non-success appear to have been largely those experienced in the Old World. Incompetent and dishonest management, selfish and impatient members, vicious methods of doing business recur with saddening iteration in the history of these stores. Larger social forces have made our country, thus far, a hard field for coöperation. The general

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prosperity of the nation has indisposed men to small savings, and active competition has cut prices in most necessaries to a figure that has left little margin for such stores. Mr. Quincy's conclusion confirms the general experience in this country, as in England, that "stores on the Rochdale plan are not adapted to large cities." Philadelphia's development of thrift in her wage-earners, and the education in association won by them in the wonderfully successful building and loan associations of that city, probably explain her exceptional experience. It is, however, an exaggeration of the ill-success of this movement to say, with Mr. Barnard, in "Coöperation as a Business," that, "in this country distributive coöperation has been marked by almost utter failure." Enough has been indicated of real success to make it seem probable that before long, with the rapid oncoming of new and harder conditions for the workingmen of this country, Mr. Collyer's jesting assurance to George Jacob Holyoake, at the reception tendered him last autumn, may turn out literally true: "We have been altogether too comfortable hitherto to do much in coöperation, but by and by we will show you the biggest thing out in this line."

R. Heber Newton.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

EARLY MAN IN AMERICA.

WHO were the earliest inhabitants of America, and when did they live? are questions which have generally been approached solely from the point of view offered by discoveries in the United States, and, until within the last three or four years, have been discussed only on the slender basis of the Calaveras skull and the implements found in gold-mining in California. In the following essay I propose to deal with them as portions of one great problem common to the Old and New Worlds, and to show that the first traces of man, as yet discovered, prove him to have lived in the same low stage of culture on both sides of the Atlantic, at a time when the hands of the geological clock pointed to the same hour over the greater part of the world. The story of early man in America is a part of the greater story of the first appearance of man on the earth, so far as he has yet been revealed by modern discovery.

Before we enter into these questions, we must define clearly what is meant by the geological clock. In dealing with events recorded in documents, we not only know the relation of one event to another, and how long an event was in coming to pass, but we can accurately measure the intervals in terms of years. This obviously cannot be done without chronicles of some sort or another. In the great geological past outside history, we have no such evidence of the flow of the years, and we can only arrange our events in due relation to each other, without knowledge either of the length of time necessary for each, or of the length of any of the intervals. Consequently we cannot fix a date, in the historical sense, for events which happened outside history, and cannot measure the antiquity of man in terms of years. The present rate of the retrocession of the Falls of Niagara, or of the deposit of Nile mud, or of stalagmite in caverns, or of the accumulation of the rocks themselves, or of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the movement of glaciers, have been vainly used as natural chronometers, on the assumption that they have been going on at the same rate through all the past, and have been warranted never to stop, or to want winding up, or to go faster or slower than at the moment the observer was looking at them. Such attempts are so obviously futile that it is not a little strange to find them seriously made by men like Wallace and Mortillet. The antiquity of man is to be measured simply by an appeal to the succession of events in the geological record, by the changes in the face of nature, in climate, in geography, and in the forms of life.

The change in life has been so regular, definite, and orderly in the geological past, that it enables us to classify the rocks over the whole world into Primary, Secondary, and Tertiary groups. In the last of these, the higher types of Mammalia become more and more specialized as we draw nearer to the frontiers of history; and their pedigrees, when traced from one period to another, assume the shape of genealogical trees, such as that which Professor Marsh has discovered for the horse. The living orders first appear in the Eocene, the living genera in the Miocene, a few living species in the Pliocene, while nearly all the living species come in in the Pleistocene division. Again, in the interval dividing the last from the Historic period, the domestic animals appear and the cultivated fruits, and this—the Prehistoric—gradually passes into the period embraced by the written records. The succession of events may be used as the figures on our dial-plate, marking the lapse of geological time in the Tertiary period, as follows: (1.) The Eocene period, in which the placental mammals now on the earth were represented by extinct allied forms belonging to existing families and orders. The order Primates, to which man belongs, is represented by creatures allied to the lemurs both in the Old and New Worlds. (2.) The Miocene, in which the alliance between living and extinct mammals is more close, and living genera appear. The Primates are represented by a higher division, the family of apes, in Europe and in the United States. (3.) The Pliocene, in which, for the first time, living mammalian species appear; but they are few in number compared with the extinct species. (4.) The Pleistocene, in which the living species are more abundant than the extinct among the Mammalia, and the Primates are represented by their highest development, the family of man.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

(5.) The Prehistoric, characterized by the present fauna and flora, being in possession of the regions in which they have been known historically. Man has increased and multiplied on the earth, and is possessed of domesticated animals and cultivated fruits, and has acquired the arts of spinning, weaving, mining, and pottery making in the Old World, and gradually passed through the Neolithic, Bronze and Iron stages of civilization. (6.) The Historic, or period covered by written records, which varies in each country, going back to 4000 B. C. in Egypt, and in America to the time of Christopher Columbus. Were the extinct species taken into account, it would be seen that they fill up the interval separating one living form from another, and that they approximate to living species as they approach nearer to the present time.

It will be seen from the examination of the above periods that the inquiry into the antiquity of man is limited to the last four. The most highly specialized form in the animal kingdom cannot be looked for until the lower animals by which he is now surrounded made their appearance. We cannot imagine him to have been living in the Eocene age, when animal life was not sufficiently differentiated to present us with living genera of placental mammals. Nor is there any probability of his having appeared on the earth in the Miocene, because of the absence of placental mammals belonging to living species. It is most unlikely that man should appear in a fauna in which there was no other living mammal. He belongs to a more advanced stage of evolution than that presented by the mid-Miocene of Thenay, in which flint splinters fashioned by man are said to have occurred. Up to this time, the evolution of the animal kingdom had advanced no farther than the *Simiadæ* in the direction of man, and the apes then haunting the forests of Italy, France, and Germany were the most highly organized types. We may also look at the question from another point of view. If man were upon the earth in the Miocene age, it is incredible that he should not have become something else while those changes were going on in the conditions of life by which all the Miocene land mammalia have been so profoundly affected that they have either assumed new forms or been exterminated. It is impossible to believe that man should have been an exception to the law of change. Nor in the succeeding Pliocene age can we expect to find traces of man upon the earth. The living placental mam-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mals had only then begun to appear, and seeing that the higher animals have invariably appeared in the rocks according to their place in the zoölogical scale, Fishes, Amphibians, Reptiles, Placental Mammals, it is hardly reasonable to suppose that the highest of all should then have been upon the earth. The few scored bones in the Pliocene strata of Italy, referred by Prof. Capelini to the work of Pliocene man, are considered by Evans and Mortillet to have been marked by the teeth of the large sharks abundant in those seas. And if they be artificial it is not, in my opinion, proved that they were marked in the Pliocene age. "The fossil man of Denise" is of uncertain age, and other alleged cases of Pliocene man in Europe have now been given up.

The question has however been revived in the United States by Prof. Whitney, in his work on the Auriferous Gravels of California, and the existence of man in California, in the Pliocene age, has been accepted by such high authorities as Marsh, Le Conte, and others. It becomes, therefore, necessary for us to see how the facts will stand the test of criticism. In the first place, it is assumed that the auriferous gravels in the Sierras, with traces of man, which are in some places three hundred feet thick, and sometimes covered with ancient lava streams, are of Pliocene age. They are, however, proved by their fossils, identified by Dr. Leidy, to have been deposited by the streams from the Miocene *(Elotherium)* age down to the present time. Among the animals we may note the skull of a mustang, identical with that of Mexico and California, which could not have been buried in the gravels of Sierra County before the time of the Spanish conquest, when the living race of horses was introduced. Consequently, the discovery of human remains in the auriferous gravels does not prove that man was an inhabitant of Pliocene America, even if it be allowed that they are of the same age as the strata in which they lie. There is, however, no evidence of this in any one instance. The objects themselves point to a directly opposite conclusion. The stone mortars, pestles, polished stone axes, beads, etc., found at various depths, are identical with those scattered over the surface, and used by the Indian tribes of California, described by Bancroft in his "Native Races of the Pacific States," and more recently by various writers in the seventh volume of the United States Geographical Survey under the direction of Captain Wheeler. The human bones are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

indistinguishable from those of the Red Indians. The famous Calaveras skull, according to Prof. Wyman, is related to the Indian type, with a doubtful affinity with the Eskimos. It was obtained from a shaft sunk through three alternate layers of gravel and basalt, at a depth of one hundred and thirty-two feet from the surface, was associated with the remains of other individuals, and had been buried along with shell-beads of the kind usually met with in Indian interments. Had these remains been found near the surface they would have been undoubtedly classified with the ordinary traces of Indians, and their occurrence at so great a depth is the sole cause of their being the object of special interest.

Nor have we to go far to account for their presence at great depths. It is very strange that Prof. Whitney should have ignored the fact that mining operations have been carried on in those very districts long before the time of "the forties." "In 1849," writes Schoolcraft ("Archæology," vol. i., p. 105), "the gold-diggers at one of the mountain diggings, called Murphy's, were surprised, in examining a high, barren district of mountain, to find an old site of a mine, with a shaft two hundred and ten feet deep, at the bottom of which were a human skeleton, an 'altar,' and other remains of an ancient people, — probably Indian." In other ancient mines in the Western States, as Dr. Southall has recently pointed out, human skeletons have been met with, which prove that gold mining was extensively carried on long before the discovery of gold in the present century. The whole group of human remains, therefore, in the auriferous deposits, instead of proving the existence of Red Indians in California in the Pliocene age, belong to a comparatively modern period. Some are probably the results of interments which took place in deep mines or in superficial deposits, while others have found their way by accident into the auriferous gravels from the surface at various times. The famous ode of Bret Harte, in which he humorously puts down the Calaveras skull to a miner from Missouri,—"But I'd take it kindly if you'd send the pieces home to old Missouri,"—is true so far as the mining is concerned, and M. Simonin was not so wide of the mark as appears at first sight, when he seriously followed Mr. Bret Harte in ascribing, in the "Revue des Deux Mondes," the "Pliocene skull" to "*un mineur Missourien*." The remains, looked at purely from the archæological point of view, are Neolithic, and identical with

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

those which unmistakably belong to the ancient Indian tribes of North America. We cannot seriously entertain the idea that mankind first appeared on the earth in the Neolithic stage of culture, identical, so far as we know, in every respect with the ancestors of the present Red Indians, at a time when there were but few living species of the higher mammalia, and that he lived in California before cañons from two to three thousand feet had been cut by the existing streams out of the solid rock. Neither in the New nor in the Old World is there any trace of Pliocene man revealed by modern discovery.

We come now in our inquiry to the succeeding period, when the higher Mammalia, now contemporary with man, appeared in force on the earth, and man himself may be reasonably looked for. We will take the point of view, first of all, offered by Europe. The Pleistocene, or Quaternary, period in Europe is characterized by the arrival of numerous living species, which are divisible into four natural groups, according to their present *habitats*. To the first belong those now living in the temperate zone in the northern hemisphere, such as the mole, musk-shrew, beaver, lynx, wild-cat, wolf, fox, martin, ermine, stoat, otter, brown and grizzly bear, horse, bison, urus, saiga antelope, stag, roe, fallow-deer, and wild boar. They emigrated from Asia, and some pushed their way as far south as northern Africa. The second consists of arctic animals, such as the arctic hare and lemming, musk-sheep, reindeer, and wolverine. These animals also came from Asia, and found their way as far to the south as the Alps and Pyrenees, and as far to the west as Ireland. The third group is composed of those animals now enjoying the cold climate of high altitudes in Europe, such as the chamois, ibex, and Alpine marmot. The fourth is represented by animals now only found in warm countries, such as the lion, panther, African lynx, spotted and striped hyena, hippopotamus, and African elephant and porcupine. The remains of these animals lie scattered over southern Europe, and as far to the north as Yorkshire, and to the west as Ireland. With these, certain extinct species appear, hitherto unknown, such as the straight-tusked elephant, mammoth, pigmy elephant, woolly and small-nosed rhinoceroses, the Irish elk, pigmy hippopotamus, and the cave bear. The distribution of these animals throws a flood of light on the geography and climate of Pleistocene Europe. The British Isles, at the time of their migration, must have formed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part of the continent, and the evidence is tolerably clear that the hundred fathom line off the west coast of Ireland was then the Atlantic coast line. The area of the North Sea was a broad, open valley, gashed by a deep fjord extending close to Norway and as far as Denmark. The Mediterranean occupied a much smaller area than it does now, and was isolated from the Atlantic by a land barrier, extending in the direction of the Straits of Gibraltar, along which the animals could migrate freely between Spain and northern Africa. It was also cut into two deep basins by a neck of land extending northward from Cape Bon, by way of Malta and Sicily, along which the animals, now found in the bone caves and river deposits of those regions, could freely pass. To account, indeed, for the distribution of animals in the islands, we must believe that, in those days, the Mediterranean area was elevated about 2400 feet above its present level, a change which would unite Corsica and Sardinia to France, turn the Adriatic into a broad valley, and elevate the islands of the Greek Archipelago into mountain peaks.

The climate of Europe at this time differed considerably from that of the present day. To allow of the northern animals penetrating as far south as the Alps and Pyrenees, the temperature in middle Europe must have been low, while it must have been high for animals of warm habits, such as the hippopotamus, to have lived as far north as the British Isles. The remains of both these groups are so intermingled in the river deposits and caves throughout middle Europe—hippopotamus with reindeer and the like—that it is impossible to refer them to periods separated from each other by long intervals. In most of the caves the gnawed remains prove that the reindeer formed a large part of the prey of the spotted hyena. The solution of this difficulty lies in the fact that Europe was then a large tract of land, reaching from northern Africa far into the Atlantic, and therefore enjoyed a continental climate, with the summer heat greater than now, and the winter cold more severe. But this only disposes of one part of the difficulty, for it is not likely that the animals would swing to and fro over such a wide area as that reaching from the Pyrenees to the Baltic in one season. There must, therefore, have been some other cause at work, and that cause is distinctly shown, by the ice marks scattered far and wide over the flanks of the mountains of central and southern Europe and over the low-lying districts in the north, to have been a secular and gradual

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowering of temperature, until it reached its minimum, probably with long pauses and possibly with the return of warmer conditions. Owing to these climatal changes every inch of ground, in middle and western Europe, would successively form a frontier between the northern and southern animals, and their remains would be mingled together as we find them to be. During the extreme cold, the arctic animals would arrive at their southern limit. Closely following on this lowering of the temperature to its minimum, geographical changes of great magnitude took place in the north of Europe. The area to the north of the line passing from the lower valley of the Severn eastward into Russia was depressed beneath the waves of a berg-laden sea, and again lifted up so that the British Isles, then an archipelago, again formed part of the main-land. As the land emerged from the water, the Pleistocene forests crept over it, and the animals found their way over the southern and midland counties.

Such as this was the scene on which man first appears in Europe. Rude splinters of stone, and roughly chipped pebbles of flint and chert, at their very best trimmed to an almond shape, and mostly intended for use in the hand, occur abundantly in the river deposits of England and France, in association with the remains of the above animals. They are the implements of savages living by the chase, and probably also by fishing and fowling. Not only have the implements been discovered, but the very spots on the river-bank where the hunter sat and made them have been identified, as at Crayford and other places in the valley of the Thames. Could we have penetrated to the banks of the Thames, or of the Seine, in those times, guided by a thin column of smoke rising over the trees till we reached the camp of the river-drift hunter, we might have seen the men selecting blocks of flint and chipping their implements out of them, the women preparing the half raw meal of flesh, it may be of reindeer, mammoth, or rhinoceros, while the children broke the silence of the evening with their shouts on those very spots where are now to be heard, day and night, the voices of London and Paris.

Nor can there be much doubt as to the relation of the river-drift hunter to the above-mentioned changes in climate and geography, which are usually summed up under the term Glacial. The balance of evidence is in favor of the view that the hunter at Crayford was in the valley of the Thames before the submergence, and before the temperature had reached its minimum,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

or in other words, in Preglacial times. The river-drift hunter whose implements are left at Abbeville traversed the shore of a berg-laden sea, and possibly may have inherited a tradition from his ancestors of the famous hunting-grounds then lying at the bottom of the British Channel and the great Northern Ocean. The hunter who followed the hippopotamus and the reindeer in the valley of the Ouse, near Bedford, was there after the reëlevation of the land and the cutting of the valley through the mantle of bowlder clay which had been dropped from the melting bergs. He probably went far enough northward to see the glaciers then crowning the Pennine chain and the mountainous regions of Wales.

Southward, the river-drift man wandered far and wide over France, hunting the same animals in the valleys of the Rhone, Loire, and Garonne as in the valley of the Thames. In the Iberian peninsula he was a contemporary of the African elephant, the mammoth, and the straight-tusked elephant, and he camped in the neighborhood both of Lisbon and Madrid, showing here, as in France and Britain, singular facility in choosing places, which became, in the long ages which were to follow, the sites of great capitals. He also ranged over Italy, leaving his implements behind in the Abruzzo; and in Greece, in the neighborhood of Corinth, he was familiar with the extinct pigmy hippopotamus. We can also track him south of the Mediterranean by the implements found in Oran, and near Kolea in Algeria, in the Sahara, and in several places in Egypt. At Luxor, they have been discovered by General Pitt Rivers in the breccia, out of which are hewn the tombs of the Egyptian kings. In Palestine, they have been obtained by the Abbé Richard between Mount Tabor and the Sea of Tiberias, and by Mr. Stopes between Jerusalem and Bethlehem. Throughout this wide area the implements are of the same rude type, and generally of the same materials, flint or quartzite, those of Luxor and Palestine being identical with those in the river valleys of Britain and of France. Throughout this area, too, the river-drift man hunted some or other of those animals which we have mentioned above.

Nor is our survey yet ended. He is proved by many discoveries to have ranged over the Indian peninsula, from the valley of the Nerbudda in the north as far as Madras. Here we find him forming part of a fauna in which are to be numbered species now living in India, such as the Indian rhinoceros and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the arnee, as well as extinct types of oxen and elephants. There were two extinct hippopotami in the rivers, as well as living gavials, turtles, and tortoises. It is plain, therefore, that at this time the higher mammals of India stood in the same relation to the present Indian animals as the European fauna of the Pleistocene does to that now living in Europe. In both there was a similar association of living with extinct forms, and in both the central figure is the river-drift hunter.

We are led from the region of tropical India to the banks of the Delaware in New Jersey, by the recent discoveries of Dr. Abbott, in the neighborhood of Trenton, which I have had the opportunity of examining with that gentleman and Professors Haynes and Lewis. The implements are of the same type, and occur under exactly the same conditions, as the river-drift implements of Europe. They are found in a terrace of river gravel and loam overlooking the river, and are composed of materials derived from the old terminal moraine which strikes across the States of New Jersey and Pennsylvania in the direction of Lake Erie. The large blocks of stone which it contains indicate that during the time of its accumulation there were ice rafts floating down the Delaware in the spring, as in the Thames, the Seine, and the Somme in those days. According to Professor Lewis, it was formed either during the time when the glacier of the Delaware was retreating ("Late Glacial") or a later period ("Post-Glacial"). The physical evidence is clear that it belongs to the same age as the deposits with similar remains in Europe. The fossil animals—the reindeer, bison, and mastodon—found in it also point to the same conclusion. These animals belong to a fauna occurring in fluviatile deposits in North America, composed of the same elements, and even some of the same species (as may be seen in Dr. Leidy's lists) as that of the Pleistocenes of Europe. In it living and extinct forms, and those now found in warm and cold regions, were mingled together. To the temperate division belong the Virginian deer, the bison, raccoon, and the stag, the beaver and the elk; to the northern, the reindeer and musk-sheep; to the southern, the tapir and peccary. Among the extinct species we may note the American variety of the mammoth, the mastodon, and the great sloths — *Megatherium*, *Megalonyx*, and *Mylodon*, as well as a species of capybara and of musk-sheep. The *Felis atrox* of Dr. Leidy I am unable to distinguish from the cave-lion of Europe. All these animals were probably familiar to the river-drift

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

hunter as he passed northward to the edge of the great glacier, or southward into the tropics of Central America. He was encamped at Trenton either while New York lay buried under the ice—which has left its unmistakable marks in the smoothed rocks of the Central Park—or while that ice was melting away. Thus, in our survey of the conditions of life when man first appeared in Europe, India, and North America, we see that the animal life was in the same stage of evolution, and that "the old order" was yielding place "unto the new" in these three regions so widely removed from each other. The river-drift hunter is proved by his surroundings to belong to the Pleistocene age in all three.

It remains for us to weave the scattered threads of the inquiry into general conclusions. The identity of the implements proves that the river-drift hunter was in the same rude state of civilization, if it can be called civilization, in the Old and New worlds, while the hand of the geological clock pointed to the same hour. It is not a little strange that his mode of life should have been the same in the lands bordering on the Mediterranean, in the tropical forests of India, and on both sides of the Atlantic. The hunter of the reindeer in the valley of the Delaware was the same kind of savage as the hunter of the reindeer on the banks of the Thames or the Seine. It does not, however, follow that this identity of implements implies that the same race of men ranged over this vast tract. While this may be left an open question, it certainly indicates a primeval condition of savagery, from which mankind has emerged in the long ages that separate it from our own time. We may also infer from his wide range that the river-drift hunter (assuming that mankind sprang from one center) inhabited the earth for a long time, and that his dispersal took place before the glacial submergence and the lowering of the temperature in northern Europe, Asia, and America. It is not reasonable to suppose that the Straits of Behring could have offered a free passage either to the rivef-drift man migrating from Asia to America, or to the American animals from America to Europe, while there was a great barrier of ice, or of sea, or of both, in the high northern latitudes.

It will naturally be asked who and what was the river-drift hunter. The question can only be partially answered in the present stage of the inquiry. The few fragments of human

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bones, beyond doubt associated with the implements, are too imperfect to offer any evidence as to race. They, however, point out unmistakably that he was a man, and not "a missing link," and that he was without traces of Simian ancestry, such as have been ascribed to him by Mortillet and others. On this important point I entirely agree with Dr. Virchow. The river-drift man has vanished from the face of the earth without leaving any clew to his identification with any living race. After him the race of cave-men appeared in Europe, now represented by the Eskimos.

We may realize before the rock-hewn tombs at Luxor the impossibility of measuring the date of the river-drift hunter in terms of years. In the interval between the time of his encampment on the site of ancient Thebes and the rise of the splendor of Egypt, the conditions of life described in the preceding pages passed away, and man had progressed from the hunter stage of civilization into that of the Neolithic, of the Bronze, and of the Iron ages. He stands on the other side of an abyss of past time, the depth of which has not been, and which in my opinion cannot be, fathomed.

W. Boyd Dawkins.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ASTRONOMICAL COLLISIONS.

THE universe of space is, in one sense, full and crowded. Everywhere our telescopes find stars; and for every one we see there are probably hundreds, and even thousands, too faint or small or far away to reach our senses. And of this countless host of worlds not one is at rest, but all are rushing through space, free and unbridled, with velocities far exceeding anything in the range of our terrestrial experience. Our swiftest cannon-shot takes more than three seconds to go a mile, but the stars and planets seldom move slower than five miles a second, and some of them go two hundred. The veriest snail among them would overhaul a rifle-ball in the same sort of way that the rifle-ball would overtake a receding freight train. Is there not, then, danger of collisions? Have such collisions ever occurred; and, if so, with what consequences?

Now, in the first place, it is only in a sense, and rather a Pickwickian one, that space can be called crowded. True, stars are to be seen in every direction; but this is because our vision reaches so unimaginably far. If we restrict our consideration to bodies of respectable magnitude,—a hundred miles in diameter, for instance,—we ought rather to say that space, instead of being crowded, is almost inconceivably empty. Between any star or planet and its nearest neighbor, lie usually desolate distances of millions, or even millions of millions, of miles. If we assume, what is probably an under-estimate, that the region commanded by our telescopes is so vast that light takes a thousand years in coming to us from its outer confines, and, further, that the number of its stars is a thousand millions (the number visible with our largest telescopes is usually estimated at about sixty millions), then we find that the average distance from star to star must be about nine millions of millions of miles. This is not quite half the actual distance from the sun

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to our nearest stellar neighbor (α Centauri), according to the received value of its parallax; but it is a distance which quite defies the power of human comprehension. If two stars at such a distance were rushing straight toward each other with a speed of ten miles a second, it would require nearly thirty thousand years to bring them together. Represent the sun, as in Sir John Herschel's familiar illustration, by a globe two feet in diameter, so that oranges, cherries, peas, and pins'-heads would stand for the different planets at distances ranging from eighty feet to two miles, then, on that scale, α Centauri would be eight thousand miles away. Obviously, there is plenty of elbow room in the universe, and the chance of two stars accidentally jostling each other is far less than that of the collision of two bullets in mid-air over a battle-field. Still the possibility remains.

There is a prevalent impression that the immunity from collision between the heavenly bodies depends mainly on their being held in orderly orbits by central attraction; and it is true that their orbital constraints make it quite impossible for the *planets* to collide with each other, or even to approach each other very closely. But a very impressive picture is sometimes drawn of what would happen if the earth, for instance, should some time free herself from the bonds of gravitation — how she would fly off into space (which is true, of course), and soon dash herself to pieces against some other wandering world (which is not true at all, or at least not probable). Most likely, if gravitation were suddenly to cease, the earth would travel for millions, not of years, but of ages, without ever encountering anything more important than meteors, such as are now continually falling upon her surface. And these meteoric encounters, even, would probably be far less frequent than at present, since there is reason to suppose that such bodies are much more numerous in the neighborhood of the sun, and of other great stars, than in the rest of space.

Evidently, however, the attractions between a wandering star and others lying near its path must considerably increase the chances of collision, though not to so great an extent as perhaps might be supposed. A body entering our system at a distance from the sun one hundred times as great as the radius of the earth's orbit, and moving with no more than the velocity natural to a comet at that distance (about $2\frac{2}{3}$ miles per second), would not strike the sun unless its path were directed within less than half a degree (23.′4) of the sun's center; and if

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

its velocity were greater, the aim would have to be still more accurate to score a hit. If bodies were shot into space at random from the position and with the velocity indicated, only about one in eighty-six thousand would hit the sun. Were it not for the sun's attraction, however, the proportion would be twenty thousand times smaller still—only one in seventeen hundred millions.

It is obvious, therefore, that encounters between heavenly bodies of considerable magnitude must be extremely rare. There is not in all the astronomical record a single certain instance of such an occurrence. And yet it may confidently be asserted that some time or other in the past such events must have happened, and some time in the future will happen again; simply for the reason that, in a sufficient length of time, the most improbable things, if only not impossible, are sure to come to pass. Now, it is almost certain that the stellar motions are not such as to render collisions impossible: the planets, it is true, as has been said before, can never run into each other, because of the size and nature of their orbits, but, so far as can now be ascertained, nothing of the sort holds good for the motions of the stars. We already know enough about some of their so-called "proper motions" to be quite sure that, as a fact, they are not traveling in any simple curves around any common center, and also that some stars are flying through space with such velocities that no attraction, such as can reasonably be supposed to act in the premises, can control them. Nor does theory, any more than observation, indicate a structure of the stellar universe at all analogous to that of the planetary system. Among the stars there is no central dominance and no imperial power, but we have to do with a republic of comparatively free and independent members.

Sir William Thomson is therefore fully justified in writing: "It is as sure that collisions must occur between great masses moving through space as it is that ships, steered without intelligence to prevent collision, could not cross and recross the Atlantic for thousands of years with immunity from collision." Undoubtedly, the chance of an encounter between a pair of heavenly bodies, selected at random, is trifling, almost beyond the power of computation, and the intervals of time between such catastrophes, in that part of the heavens subject to human observation, must be, on the average, enormous; but yet, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

infinite time and unbounded space—somewhere or other now, sometime or other here—such things are happening, or will come to pass.

If ever two great worlds do really meet in this way, it is possible to predict some of the consequences. To use the technical language of science, "their energy of molar motion will be converted into various forms of molecular and potential energy"; which, translated into the vernacular, means that there will be evolution of heat and light, while at the same time the solids present will be wholly or in part liquefied, the liquids vaporized, and the vapors and gases rarefied and expanded. The intensity of the action will depend, of course, mainly upon the mass and swiftness of the colliding bodies; but an easy calculation shows that if our earth were ever to meet another globe like herself, and moving with the same velocity, heat enough would be generated by the shock to transform them both into a huge ball of vapor; unless, indeed, the central core of the earth is much colder and more refractory than usually supposed. At any rate, the quantity of heat developed would be sufficient to melt, boil, and completely vaporize a mass of ice fully seven hundred times that of both the colliding worlds—an ice planet 150,000 miles in diameter.

If, however, the impinging masses were, to begin with, mainly gaseous (as the sun seems to be), the effect might be curiously different. Heat would, of course, be generated, just as in the case of solid bodies; but, as a consequence, apparently most paradoxical, the resulting nebula might actually be cooler than either of the bodies before the encounter; of course, it would be immensely expanded in volume. Just as a gaseous mass, contracting under its own gravity from loss of heat by radiation at its surface, continually rises in temperature, so a similar mass, expanding against its own gravity from accession of heat within, may fall in temperature,—nay, must fall, if the body is composed of "perfect" gas. Of course, immediately after the collision, and before the ultimate expansion of bulk was attained, the temperature and brilliance of the mass would be for a time vastly increased, but the final result would be as stated.

In a preceding paragraph it was said that we have not on the astronomical records a single certain instance of any collision between bodies of considerable size. But there have been several cases of a most remarkable phenomenon, which perhaps may owe its explanation to such encounters. Stars, never before vis-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ible, or else known only as faint and minute, have suddenly blazed out, shining sometimes with the brilliance of Sirius, or even Venus, and afterward faded away to their original insignificance. Such was the famous star of 1572, so carefully observed by Tycho Brahe. As recently as 1866, and again in 1876, similar things have happened, though these later stars were less conspicuous. The star of 1876 (in the constellation of Cygnus) had long been known and catalogued as a telescopic star of the ninth magnitude, with nothing to distinguish it from any of the common herd. On November 24th it suddenly shone out as bright as the pole-star. Schmidt, of Athens, who discovered it, had been observing that very region of the sky only four days before, and no such object was then visible. The intervening days were cloudy, so that we cannot tell precisely the hour when it first blazed up, but evidently its increase of brightness must have been extremely rapid. Immediately after Schmidt's observation it began to fade, but it was two weeks before it fell below the sixth magnitude and became invisible to the naked eye, and it was more than a year before it resumed its original faintness. Its whole course was carefully watched with the spectroscope. At first, and for some months, like the star of 1866, it showed conspicuous in its spectrum the lines of hydrogen, together with other lines of uncertain origin. As its brightness decreased the hydrogen lines faded still more rapidly, leaving other lines more prominent, until, at last, the spectrum, instead of becoming that of an ordinary star, came to consist simply of three bright lines, the spectrum of a nebula, and it continues such to this day. Whether this is, or is not, the same spectrum it had before the outburst no one can say, as it had never been observed with the spectroscope before.

Now, I am very far from asserting that this was a case of collision; and yet it is clear enough that the whole course of phenomena was very much what might have been expected if it were. At any rate, the collision hypothesis is held and defended by several astronomers of authority, and the principal reason for preferring a different possible explanation lies in the fact that these "temporary stars," as they are called, are far too common to be probably due to stellar encounters. We have on record eight since the Christian era, and no less than three of them since 1840.

It is hardly necessary to say, that if any retinue of planets attends such a star, its sudden blaze cannot fail to carry disas-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ter and destruction to all life upon them. We can conceive that forms of life may be possible under almost any imaginable physical conditions, provided only the course of events by which they have been reached has been gradual enough to allow the necessary adaptations. One would not dare to deny the possibility of life of some kind on the airless moon, or even on the sun itself. But all we know makes it certain that no planetary life could survive the tremendous and catastrophic change of conditions involved in a sudden thousand-fold increase of the solar radiation.

Thus far we have been considering only collisions of stellar masses. But space is filled also with minor particles, separated from each other only by intervals of a few hundred miles; and these, in the form of meteors and shooting-stars, are rushing through space, dropping continually upon the larger worlds, increasing their size, and adding to their store of heat and energy. Every year the earth encounters nearly three thousand millions of them, according to the estimate of Professor Newton, ranging from the merest particles to masses of several hundredweight. Very probably, also, the comets belong to the same category, being really nothing but larger meteors, or flocks of small meteors, or perhaps even only puffs of meteoric dust. Nearly all the meteors which strike the earth are very minute. Perhaps a hundred or so reach the ground each year as recognizable masses of stone or iron, weighing from an ounce or two to some hundreds of pounds, but all the rest are dissipated in the upper air, and never come down unless as impalpable dust, not to be certainly identified. The whole amount of matter falling daily upon the earth from outer space is probably about one hundred tons on the average (it is variously estimated from twenty-five to five hundred). A hundred tons is in itself a very considerable quantity, but utterly insignificant as compared with the mass of the earth, and entirely incapable of appreciable effect upon our temperature. Assuming even the largest estimate (five hundred tons a day), and also that the average velocity with which meteors enter our atmosphere is fifteen miles a second (probably considerably too large), we find that the heat annually received from them by the earth is only about fifty-three calories for each square meter of her surface,—less than would be imparted by two minutes' perpendicular sunshine, and only about $\frac{1}{60,000}$ of the heat actually received from the sun

26

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in a year. Retaining the same extravagant estimate of five hundred tons a day, it appears that the earth's diameter would grow an inch in about one hundred millions of years, and that her distance from the sun would be reduced about eighty-three feet in a million years, in consequence of the resistance experienced in moving through the meteoric swarms.

It would not, however, be just to the general reader to dismiss the subject without fair notice that some most eminent astronomers hold views at variance with those above expressed. The late Professor Peirce maintained to the end that the heat of the sun is chiefly due to the impact of meteors, and also that the earth itself receives as much heat from meteors as from the sun, a necessary result if the solar heat is really so produced. Of course, we have no space to discuss the matter here, and must be content with merely saying that the quantity of matter which falls upon the earth, if his idea is correct, ought to be easily noticeable, amounting to about fifty tons a day on each square mile. It involves also serious difficulties in the planetary theory.

So far as human beings are concerned, the most important question connected with our subject is whether anything is to be feared from comets, as a consequence either of collisions with the earth or of their fall into the sun. It may be said, just as of the stars before, first, that cometary collisions, either with sun or earth, must be very rare occurrences; and, secondly, that they are practically certain to happen sometime or other. Babinet computed, on the one hand, that a comet would strike the earth on the average about once in fifteen million years; on the other, we know at least three comets whose orbits cut the earth's path so closely that, if they should ever reach the crossing at the same time as the earth, a collision must occur. These comets are known as Biela's, Tempel's, followed by the Leonid meteors in its train, and the comet of 1862, which precedes the Perseids. One of the three, however (Biela's), has probably ceased to exist as a comet, and it is quite possible that the other two may vanish in the same way before we meet them.

As to cometary encounters with the sun, no comet has yet been known actually to strike the sun, but several have grazed very near it. The great comet of last year brushed through the corona, and came within three hundred thousand miles of the photosphere, and there is no assignable reason why some other comet should not actually pierce it.

As to the consequences of a comet's collision with the earth,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it is impossible to predict them with scientific certainty; probably, however, they would be insignificant. We know absolutely that the whole quantity of matter in a comet (technically, its "mass") is extremely small compared with that of the earth; but just how small no one can say. It is impossible to contradict authoritatively either the man who says he could carry a comet home in his pocket if properly packed, or one who asserts that a comet's nucleus is equivalent to an iron ball one hundred miles in diameter. An attempt has been made to get at the density of the central nucleus on the assumption that it holds to itself the enormous volume of the head and envelopes by its gravitational attraction, as if the surrounding nebulosity were an atmosphere in equilibrium around the nucleus; but the assumption is more than doubtful, and the derived conclusion, of course, is of little value. It seems, on the whole, more probable that a comet is throughout only a cloud of dust and vapor—a mere smoke-wreath—than that there is at the center any solid kernel of preponderant mass.

If a comet really has at the center any great mass of stone or iron, or even a close-packed swarm of aerolites weighing a ton or two apiece, collision with it would of course be a most serious matter, spreading devastation and conflagration possibly over half the globe at once; not amounting, probably, to anything like a destruction of the world, but far more disastrous than any earthquake or volcanic eruption. It is far more likely, however, that the encounter with a comet would be entirely harmless,—simply a most magnificent and brilliant shower of shooting-stars lasting for an hour or two,—a phenomenon which one might well desire to see.

As for the effect of a collision between a comet and the sun, in respect to which there has been much disquieting speculation of late, the probability is that we on the earth should never know it, unless we happened to be expressly watching the event. For a few minutes, just as the nucleus was piercing the photosphere, there might be some unusual flash of brilliance and a fine outburst of solar prominences, followed, perhaps, and very probably, by intense magnetic and auroral disturbances on the earth; but the main thermal transformation of the impinging energy would be effected far below the visible surface of the sun, and would result merely in a slight expansion of its bulk, far too slight to be detected by terrestrial astronomers.

C. A. YOUNG.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE SAINT PATRICK MYTH.

NEAR the close of 1882, a Bollandist, groping amid ancient MSS. in the Royal Library at Brussels, turned up a treasure precious in his eyes as the great Australian nugget. This was the full text of the "Life of St. Patrick," by Muirchu Maccumachtheni, which he compiled at the suggestion of Aedh, Bishop of Sletty, who died in 698. This is the earlier of two ancient narratives contained in the "Book of Armagh," compiled about the year 807. The other, Tirechan's, was already complete. The difference between these two earliest Lives of the Saint is that Tirechan relates precisely that Patrick received his commission to instruct the Irish from Pope Celestine. Muirchu does not mention the pope. It has been a theory that the lost part of the "Book of Armagh" contained some reference to Patrick's visit to Rome and his commission by the pope. That, however, has now been set at rest: there is no such reference in the recovered text. The fifth of Muirchu's chapters is headed, "*De inventione sancti Germani in Gallii*"; and it states that Patrick, having traveled *per gallicas Alpes ad extremum*, found a home with Germanus, at whose feet he sat, as Paul at the feet of Gamaliel, when, in a vision, he was directed by his angel, Victoricus, to go to Ireland. For that mission he was consecrated by Amatorex, by whom may be meant Amator, predecessor of Germanus (St. Germain), then Bishop of Auxerre. This also is probably fictitious, as we shall see; but it may be noted here that in the eighth century the only thread by which Patrick was connected with the Church of Rome was an alleged consecration by a Gallican bishop. But, the reader will exclaim, of what earthly importance to any human being can it be, whether an Irish bishop of the fifth century was ordained by Pope Celestine, or Amatorex, or the angel Victoricus, or neither? Be patient, O reader, and you may find hereabouts the germ, not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

only of much interesting Irish history, but of the phenomenal results of the last papal circular concerning Parnell and his League.

But did Patrick ever exist? This cannot be determined with absolute certainty. The grounds of doubt are as follows: All authorities agree that Palladius was the first Christian missionary among the Irish; that he was ordained for that work by Pope Celestine; that he was a friend of Germanus, and that he was styled Patricius in the Roman Martyrology, his day being March 16, the day before that of the received St. Patrick, when he (Palladius) is said to have died at Auvergne. The words are, "*Arvernis depositio S. Patricii episcopi.*" No contemporary ecclesiastical writer mentions Patrick, though nearly all mention Palladius. The most remarkable instance of silence is that of Bede, who mentions the missions of Palladius, Ninian, and Columba, but says nothing whatever of Patrick. That so minute and exact a historian, writing in the early eighth century, should not mention even the name of Patrick, has not been explained. Even in the writings of St. Columbanus, who flourished in the century after Patrick, the name of the latter does not occur. There is no mention of any person, supposed to be an individual Patrick, earlier than about two hundred years after he is said to have died. In a letter written by Cummian to Segienus, abbot of Iona, in the year 634, concerning the proper time of Easter, he speaks of the cycle "introduced into use by our pope, St. Patricius"; and Adamnan, a little later, writes of "Maucta, a pilgrim from Britain, a holy man, a disciple of St. Patricius, the bishop." Skene ("Celtic Scotland," ii., p. 17) accepts these as references to *the* St. Patrick, and as "sufficient to prove his existence"; but, notwithstanding such a weighty indorsement, skepticism will not fail to remember that Patricius ("our pope," as Cummian calls him) was the Roman title given to Palladius, and that it was borne by several others in the north. Tirechan himself, in the "Book of Armagh," speaks of the first Patricius and the second Patricius—*i. e.*, Palladius and Patrick. Patrick is, of course, no more a personal name than Cardinal. Muirchu (Brussels text) says that Patricius had four names—"Sochet, *quando natus est;* Contice, *quando servivit;* Mavonius, *quando legit;* Patricius, *quando ordinatus est.*" The first of these names is said to be British, and to mean "the god of war"; so that the baptismal name of Patricius is almost as suspicious as his ordination

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

name. It is a curious coincidence, if nothing more, that St. Martin, whose nephew Patrick is said to have been, appears to have received his name from "the god of war" (Mars).

Despite these and other grounds of doubt, the probabilities are thrown in favor of the existence of an individual St. Patrick by signs of genuineness in the two compositions claiming to have been written by himself. These are his "Confession" and the "Epistle to Coroticus." The "Confessio," which alone is important to this inquiry, was transcribed into the "Book of Armagh" from a manuscript then so old that the transcriber's difficulties in deciphering it frequently appear. This, of course, was more than three centuries after Patrick's death; but its authenticity is accepted by Skene, Todd, and others, mainly because of its freedom from the miraculous and extravagant incidents which at a later period accumulated about the name of Patrick. There is some superstition in it, but no statement of anything impossible; the style is simple, the latinity rude. Oudin attacked the authenticity of the document on the ground that no pontiff would have been so stupid as to send forth a missionary who could only write such barbarous Latin; but, as Todd well remarks, this is one of the strongest arguments in favor of the "Confessio," which is quite ignorant of any pontifical commission to Patrick. The contents of this Confession are briefly that he (Patrick) was the son of Calpurnius, a deacon, who had a small farm in the village of Bonaven of Tabernia; his father being a "decurio," or provincial Roman magistrate. In his sixteenth year he (Patrick) was taken captive and brought to Hiberio with many thousands. In Hiberio (as he calls Ireland) he was employed to tend cattle daily; he prayed much, often saying a hundred prayers in a day and almost as many at night. One night, in a dream, a voice said to him, "Thy fasting is well; thou shalt soon return to thy country." In a second dream, the same voice told that the ship was ready, but two hundred miles away *(cc. milia passus)*. He then fled from his master, with whom he had been in slavery six years. He found the ship, and was roughly refused passage; but while he was praying, the sailors called him, and he was taken on board. They were three days at sea, and afterward twenty-eight days "wandering in a desert." Their provisions having run short, his companions said, "Thy God is great and almighty; why canst thou not pray to Him for us, for we perish of hunger, and no inhabitants are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

here?" Patrick promised them that if they would turn in faith to God He would send them food, and soon after a herd of swine appeared. They also found some wild honey; but Patrick would not taste it because one of them said, "This is an offering; thank God," fearing that it had been offered to an idol. The same night he suffered a trial from Satan. A great stone seemed to have fallen upon him; he could not move. "How it came into my mind to call out Helias I know not; but at that moment I saw the sun rising in the heavens, and while I cried out, *Helias! Helias!* with all my might, lo, the brightness of the sun fell upon me, and straightway removed all the weight." He was sixty days with these sailors, and when they had no more food they arrived at human habitations. After a few years he was again with his parents, "in Britanniis," and they besought him not again to expose himself to dangers. "And there, in a vision at night, I saw a man coming to me as if from Hiberio, whose name was Victoricus, bearing innumerable epistles. And he gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of it which contained the words, 'The voice of the Irish.' And while I was repeating the beginning of the epistle, I imagined that I heard in my mind the voice of those who were near the wood of Foclut, which is near the Western Sea. And thus they cried: 'We pray thee, holy youth, to come, and henceforth to walk among us.' And I was greatly pricked in heart, and could read no more; and so I awoke." In another vision he saw some one praying in him, who changed into the Holy Spirit. The "Book of Armagh," says "bishop"; but Todd, whom we are now following ("Life of St. Patrick"), suggests that the copyist confounded the contraction *sps. (spiritus)* with *eps. (episcopus)*, and the context proves this. Another vision determined him to return to Ireland, though opposition is intimated. He then speaks of his success. "The sons of Scots (Irish) and daughters of chieftains now appear as monks and virgins of Christ." In the end Patrick speaks of himself as unlearned, a fool, and despised, and appeals to this and his success as evidence of his inspiration.

Although the marvels in this "Confession" are modest enough in comparison with many that we are asked to believe in the present day, a suspicious resemblance to Biblical events is now and then suggested by it; *e.g.*, the keeping of an alien's flocks; the wandering in the desert; the "wild honey"; the temptation in the wilderness—conquered, probably, with Christ's cry, *Eloi*,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eloi, which copyists turned to *Helias*, which some say was Elias, and others Helios (the Sun). It is not unnatural, however, that a religious enthusiast, looking back over his life from the verge of the grave, should find in it the hand of God reflected as in the great Scriptural examples. If the "Confession" is a forgery, it could only have been forged by some party anxious to prove that Patrick's apostolate in Ireland was absolutely independent of ecclesiastical authority; for it is inconceivable that, if there had been any such journeyings on the Continent as are mentioned in the later biographies, any visits to St. Germain and St. Martin, or any commission from Pope Celestine, they would not have been mentioned in this narrative, which ends with the words, *Et hæc est Confessio mea antequam moriar.* We might, indeed, suppose that there was a British church which would be interested to maintain for their great man an independent authority, derived directly from heaven, through visions similar to those to which Paul appealed as his credentials; but, if this "Confession" was forged in their behalf, it is miraculously free from miracles, and its Latin is aimlessly bad.

On the whole it appears reasonable to conclude that St. Patrick became the specialized title of a preacher of gentle birth, but of comparatively little learning, who, born near Glastonbury and converted by British monks, started a British mission in Ireland where Palladius had failed; that, because he and his converts had no connection with Rome, they were as little regarded by the Church of Rome as the Salvation Army now is by the Church of England; and that their leader was not mentioned by contemporary historians, or by Bede, because he was not acknowledged by the Church of Rome, but even despised. "Therefore," he says, "be amazed, both great and small, who fear God; rhetoricians and ye of the Lord, hear and inquire who aroused me, a fool, from the midst of them who seem to be wise, and skilled in the law and powerful in speech and in all things, and hath inspired me (if indeed I be such beyond others) though I am despised by this world," etc. Here we hear the voice of a primitive George Fox, or Wesley, whose race in the British Islands is very ancient and lasting. In the course of time the Church of Rome was willing to reap what Patrick had sown; but it was always mainly a gleaner in Ireland. The prompt dismissal of Palladius, the pope's missionary, by the Irish, followed immediately by their enthusiasm for Patrick, are

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

facts whose significance cannot be escaped. It is a small thing now whether we call our stage Irishman after Palladius or Patrick, whether "Paddy" or "Pat," but we are using the watchwords of an ancient and long conflict. In the end Palladius was reduced to the position of a brief forerunner to Patrick, while the latter swelled to enormous proportions.

Turning now from the probable to the mythical Patrick, we find a figure which resembles a man only as the Trojan horse resembled a horse; he is full of armed men, a compendium of controversies. Of the portraits of St. Patrick, that in Kilkenny Cathedral could alone be associated with an individual character. One found in an old Irish prayer-book shows him the ideal Archdruid. Another, much later, engraved by authority in Paris, 1629, shows him the ideal prelate, with patriarchal cross (two cross-beams), treading on snakes. A fourth I have seen in a window of Marmoutiers Convent, Tours, which shows him holding a blossoming thorn in his hand, and resembling the lowly monastic type of saint. A fifth, rudely pictured with several others in O'Leary's "Ancient Lives of St. Patrick" (New York, 1874), shows the saint conventionalized as the first person of an Irish triad, Saints Columba and Bridget being on either side of him. In reading the multifarious Patrick mythology, these figures seem summoned before the eye as varying types of the several classes of myths which have invested the saintliest name of Celtic Britain. The normal mythologic mantle of the canonical thaumaturgist is seen on the shoulders of one Patrick, broidered with legends of blind Gormas holding the infant's hand and, with a sign of the cross, causing a fountain to flow which restores his sight; of a wolf bringing back unharmed a lamb it had seized; of fourteen thousand fed with the flesh of five animals; and of a forty days' fast. But a more popular legendary mantle is that which Patrick took from the Druid magicians. There are extended accounts of how he prevailed over the marvels of these soothsayers with greater marvels; but a careful examination of the most impressive miracles of Patrick show that he came to be looked upon as a more potent Druid than the rest, and the stories of their power which he inherited prevailed in turn over his Christian miracles in the popular fancy. He dries up a flood, turns an unbelieving district into a marsh, sentences a river to sterility, makes a stone swim to float a leper whom a ship refuses to bear, causes one ma-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

gician to be struck by lightning, another to sink into the earth, makes an ugly dwarf tall and beautiful, makes a kettle boil with blocks of ice, sinks a hostile ship at sea with a sign of the cross, and calls up or appeases tempests at will.

The Celtic story of the extermination of snakes from Ireland has so defied all efforts to catholicize it that it has been tabooed. It is even difficult to find any but recent and comical accounts of the miracle most popularly associated with St. Patrick. Nay, these modern ballads are now very hard to obtain; and in my efforts to search out the story I have found that the priests dislike the story and discourage its repetition. "I never before," says an eminent Irish priest in a note before me, "heard the question about the snakes spoken of in a serious manner. I *don't think* there is an educated Catholic in Ireland who believes a syllable of the story, and, as to the fact (?) of St. Patrick's driving them out, it is nowhere to be found recorded in any authority of any value." However, it is stated by Josceline, in his "Life of Patrick" written near the close of the twelfth century, that by the power of "the staff of Christ," the saint collected the threefold plague — snakes, demons, magicians — to the high promontory called Cruachan-Ailge, now Cruachan-Phadruig (Patrick), and sent them headlong into the sea. Dr. Phené, the antiquarian whose theory of the prevalence of serpent-worship in Europe and America is so well known, tells me that, on visiting the promontory in Ireland indicated by popular tradition, he found the further legend prevailing that the snakes all landed again at another point on the coast. On repairing to this lonely region (Glen Malin Mor), he found there an ancient mound of the kind which he identifies as the monument of serpent worshipers. Concerning this, it may be stated that the illuminations of the earliest Irish MSS. have snakes and dragons continually introduced. It may well be borne in mind that serpent worship, if introduced by colonists into a region where serpents did not exist, might be expected all the more to appeal to the imagination and flourish by exaggerations which could not be checked by experience. The large ammonites found in such numbers about Whitby were long believed to be serpents turned to stone by St. Hilda, though the superstition would have been impossible in any region familiar with serpents. Snakes, even in the Zoölogical Gardens at London, can only be kept alive by blankets, and in such a climate as Ireland they could not exist; the large

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

part they play in Irish folk-lore must therefore be ascribed to imported traditions. The legend of Patrick and the Snakes does not appear to belong to the well-known Aryan family of hero-and-dragon myths, wherein the huge single monster is not banished but slain, and human prowess rather than divine potency is illustrated. The Patrick Serpent-myth bears a nearer resemblance to certain Egyptian tales, as that of Setnare (Records of the Past, iv., p. 129), who obtained the magic book of Thoth, whose powers he exercised, by killing one "little serpent" among the many reptiles and scorpions which guarded it, the rest, apparently, taking to flight. There is a legend mentioned by Josephus that Moses cleared a region in Ethiopia of snakes. Geoffrey Keatinge's "History of Ireland," published early in the seventeenth century, however uncritical, is known to contain traditions of extreme antiquity, and extracts from MSS. not accessible; and in it are materials of high value to comparative mythology. The legend here is that Prince Gadelas, grandson of the Pharaoh who pursued Israel, being bitten by a serpent, was taken to Moses, who, with a touch of his rod, healed the wound. Moses also prophesied that wherever this prince, or any of his posterity, should reign, there should be no more serpents. The Gadelians having taken possession of Ireland, the snakes disappeared. "Some, I confess," says Keatinge, "are of opinion that there were serpents in Ireland till St. Patrick arrived to propagate Christianity in that country; but this assertion depends upon the figurative manner of expression, which is to be understood of devils or infernal spirits, that may be properly called serpents, and were expelled the island by the piety and preaching of this saint." According to another tradition, told me by a well-informed Irish lady, Gadelas brought with him Moses's identical serpent (either the rod or the brazen serpent), which ate up all the snakes in Ireland. I have also heard a folk-tale of the last of the expelled serpents, that he was so huge that St. Patrick had great difficulty with him; when the exorcism prevailed the tail of the monster was seen uncoiling from his cave near Dublin, while his head was passing out of Cork harbor. In the Devon legend of St. Petroc (probably St. Patrick) the huge size of a serpent similarly sent to sea is attributed to its having swallowed all the snakes of a pit into which the Christian martyrs were thrown.

The legendary Milesian epoch of Ireland opens with a ser-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pent-bite, and a curse on the serpent, and proceeds with a Cain-and-Abel story. Heber (shepherd), ancestor of the Hibernians, was slain by his brother Airem (ploughman). Airem (or Er) was founder of the race of tillers of the soil, or Feini (wagonmen). It will not be wondered that at the Flood the Irish had a Noah of their own: this was Fintan (afterward confused with Ronan), who, surviving the Deluge, became a kind of Celtic Wandering Jew, and is said to have lived down to the time of St. Patrick, to whom he gave accounts of the primitive history. Keatinge rejects this last legend with scorn, but we may find value in it. It appears incredible that this vast mass of traditions, many of which are not Biblical, but nearly all pointing to Egyptian and Jewish regions, could have been invented since the introduction of the Bible into Ireland. It seems tolerably certain that, anterior to the Christianization of Ireland, there were in Ireland eastern myths closely resembling those of the papyri, and that the stories of the Bible found there a congenial soil. The rod that became a serpent, and swallowed up the rest, was easily made to bud into a similar myth in a land free from snakes, but it bore further fruit of the old kind. There were momentous reasons why there should be ascribed to Patrick a Divine Legation; and for this end the rods of Moses and Aaron blended and budded, as they did in the East. For, although it was the rod of Aaron that budded, according to the Bible, tradition long pointed to a tree beside the synagogue at Djizeh as having grown from the rod of Moses. The town of St. Patrice, in France, is so named from a winter-flowering prunelle which is said to have grown from the staff of St. Patrick. But the rod of Moses-Aaron also blended with a legendary staff of Christ. Patrick, in his wanderings, came to an island where, entering a house, he found a young married couple and an extremely decrepit old woman. The youth informed him that the aged woman was his great-granddaughter. Many years before, Christ, in the guise of a pilgrim, had visited them and left his staff, the potency of which still preserved the life and youth of all who were alive at the time, though their children grew old and died like others. The youth offered Patrick the magical staff, but Patrick refused to receive it unless it were given him by Christ himself. He was then led into a mountain by his familiar angel, where Christ met him, gave him the staff, and ordered him to go to Ireland. This Patrick did, taking no counsel of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

any Roman Catholic flesh and blood. He was the divinely authorized British pope, and, as we have seen, the earliest mention of him is under that title.

The mythological outcome of this early independence of the Irish Church is wonderful. Patrick is first an Irish Moses; his burning bush is visible in a supernatural fire, kindled on a hill, in sight of the pagans; the daughters of King Laoghaire (the Irish Pharaoh) find him beside the fountain, where they come to bathe; before Laoghaire he contends with the Druid soothsayers; and when the king orders his people to seize Patrick, a thick darkness falls upon the pagan hosts, with an earthquake; they kill each other, horses and chariots fly over the plain, and a remnant only escape to the mountain Monduirn. The mythological Patrick is declared to have lived to Moses's age, one hundred and twenty years. Two counties, Armagh and Down, disputed for his dead body, as Michael and Satan; and it is declared by some biographies (sixty-four are said to have been written) that the place of his burial is unknown to this day. Among the Eastern legends of Moses not found in the Bible one relates that, while he was keeping the flocks of Jethro, he searched long for a lamb lost in the wilderness, and carried it back in his arms; upon which Jahvé said, "This is the shepherd I have chosen to feed my human flock." In a Patrick legend, the Saint, when about to locate the first church in Ireland, found on the spot a roe and her fawn. His companions were about to slay them, but Patrick took the fawn in his arms and carried it, the roe trotting after, to a safe place. The legend told of both Moses and the infant Jesus, that a chief idol fell at their approach, is also told of Patrick.

The rod of Moses-Aaron was next transformed into the staff of Christ (long preserved at Armagh and Dublin, and publicly burned at the Reformation), and now blossomed into another mythology. Considerations of space prevent its being fully traced out here, but it must be said that Ireland developed something like a Christianity of its own. Its scheme of forms and miracles is now like some shattered church window, but the pieces can be sufficiently put together to show a sort of rude triad, a Madonna, and an Irish Purgatory, Hell, and Heaven. The miracles of Patrick are those of a primitive thunder-and-lightning deity, modified into an occasionally lenient *Pater*, or Father. St. Finnian (of miraculous and illegitimate birth), who

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

inherited his Sacred Staff and first brought the Gospels into Ireland, was the Son. St. Columba (dove) was the spiritual Third Person in this lost triad; while to St. Bridget was assigned the rôle of a Madonna. The ancient Irish Church was careful to enumerate its Twelve Apostles. One need only read Thomas Wright's essay on "St. Patrick's Purgatory" to discover that this miniature Irish Christianity included a complete eschatology. For some centuries it was one of the great superstitions of Europe, that those who entered the island cavern in Lough Derg passed on to witness the torments of Hell, the punishments of Purgatory, and finally the bliss of Paradise. The Keys of this Heaven and Hell were kept by the Priors until the fifteenth century, when a Dutch monk exposed the imposture, and by the pope's order the cavern was closed on St. Patrick's Day, 1497. (It is said, however, that the proprietor still gets several hundred pounds a year from the exhibition of this cavern, one of the tombs of the ancient Patrick Popedom.) According to an old poem ("Owayne Miles," MS. Cotton) it was here that Christ appeared to Patrick and gave him the famous staff *(baculus Jhesu)* and "a booke of gospelles," enabling him to give the obstinate pagans a convincing token of what awaited them in the future world.

It would exceed the aim of this paper to enter upon any speculative inquiry as to the sources of the Church of Patrick. There is no trustworthy evidence that St. Patrick came from or ever visited the continent of Europe. There are many indications that the original Irish Church was an independent formation, which resolutely defended itself from all encroachments of the Roman Catholic authority. It claimed a commission from Christ himself, and a power to cast out devils and tread on serpents, in his name alone. The earliest legends all point to this conclusion. It is related, for instance, that when St. Finnian, who held the *baculus Jhesu*, desired to visit Rome, an angel said to him: "What would be given to thee at Rome shall be given to thee here. Arise and renew sound doctrine and faith in Ireland after Patrick." The Apostles of Ireland went into various parts of Europe; they had a different tonsure, a different Easter from other Christians, and refused to change their customs at the pope's order. They found their prophecies of Patrick's advent in Druidic runes, and their authority in his miracles. In the middle of the twelfth century, the one English

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pope (Nicholas Breakspeare, Adrian IV.) gave Ireland to Henry II. as a donation. Of the dragons' teeth sown by those two Englishmen in Ireland the harvest is too perennial and familiar to require description; but it is the irony of history that England forced upon Ireland the Roman Catholic authority which that people were afterward so remorselessly punished for acknowledging; until now, when England seeks help at Rome to govern Ireland, it is confronted by the revived spirit of Patrick and his non-Catholic church!

The pope enjoins on the Irish of to-day the obedience to Rome practiced by St. Patrick. If he should receive just that, his holiness would have to pray for the reverse. It would be rash to predict that Leo XIII. will receive the reply of St. Columbanus to Boniface IV., "Your jurisdiction as Bishop of Rome does not extend beyond the limits of the Roman empire"; but it will pretty certainly be found that the present pope will be as unable as his predecessors to sustain any practical point against the sentiments or interests of the Irish people. The pope never canonized an Irishman until the twelfth century, when the Archbishop of Armagh (Malachy) received that honor; but none the less it is Irish saints, with rare exceptions, after whom the churches of Ireland are named and who are worshiped at wells and other sacred places. The St. Patrick's Day celebrated by the peasants of Ireland is not that appointed by the church, but that of Crum-duibh, the old god, at the end of summer. M. Renan says: "Religion is the form behind which the Celtic races disguise their love of the ideal, but it would be a mistake to imagine that religion is to them a tie or a servitude. No race has a greater independence of sentiment in religion. It was not until the twelfth century, and owing to the support which the Normans of France gave to the See of Rome, that Breton Christianity was unmistakably brought into the current of Catholicism. It would have taken very little for the Bretons of France to have become Protestant like their brethren the Welsh of England." All this is true of the Irish, and no man understands it better than the last incarnation of the saint who is Renan in Brittany, Ronan in Britain, in Ireland Moronog (*i. e.*, my little Ronan); whose name is geographically a sacred foot-print of the British Celt. The sword of Cromwell destroyed the last possibility of union between Patrick and Protestantism; but it were easy for a pope to do the like

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

between Patrick and Romanism. In the fifth century, Ireland consisted of clans at war with one another. Each Irishman was so loyal to his clan chief that he would obey his order, were it to slay his own child. In all the accounts of the ministry of Patrick, he is never seen preaching to the people; he always goes straight to the chieftain, to convert whom is to convert his clan. There is no instance of a man's refusing baptism after his chief had undergone it. Patrick is a name for the union of many clans, and their incarnation in a Celtic clan-Christianity. Twelve hundred years of consecrated clan-loyalty are behind Parnell in his conflict with the Roman Leo and the British Lion.

"If you would understand a people, you must understand their gods," said Quinet. St. Patrick was, no doubt, a kindly man, but he became a vindictive deity; for he was figure-head of clans, with whom the *vendetta* is intertribal law. The English race cannot understand the spiritualization of a *vendetta*, and its transmission through a thousand years. Their own faith is founded on a feud between the seed of the woman and the serpent; but the English care less about that than for George and the Dragon stamped on a sovereign. Had Cæsar conquered Ireland, such ideas might have faded to phrases there also; but the Celt was conquered by the Saxon while as yet both were tribes; and the English have inherited the burthen of Saxon success, without any corresponding sense of the need of relieving themselves of it by magnanimity. But St. Patrick is more to the Irishman than a race-feud; this is but the shadow cast by the resplendent ideal on the future as the mirage of a fabulously glorious past. Lately, when Kelly was executed at Dublin, it was telegraphed to the London press that a crow perched on the prison, and remained there till the black flag was hoisted. Probably, if the natural history of that bird were traced, it would be found a descendant of that dark-plumed flock at which Patrick hurled his bell on that day when the Angel of the Burning Bush granted his prayer "to be the Judge of Erin on the Last Day." For Erin could not trust any other judge of quick and dead. Deities who have ecclesiastical systems, or solar systems, to attend to, may linger as names on the lips, but not reign in the hearts of a people scarred by centuries of oppression and contempt from the nation most favored by such deities. The God of Ireland is not the God of England. The Irish are the Celtic Jews;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with a Jewish faith, intensified by residence in their Land of Promise, they look back to their Golden Age when their guardian deity walked with the patriarchs and prophets of Erin. All the wondrous isles to which St. Brendan, the Celtic Odysseus voyaged, are gathered in the Erin of Patrick, with its emerald fields, crystal lakes, happy villages, and grand monasteries distributing health and wealth through the land. It is a lost paradise; a Saxon serpent destroyed it; but the Irishman believes he will regain it by the blessing of his Celtic Messiah, St. Patrick. That which never existed cannot be regained. The time has gone by when a tribal victory can be gained in the highway of civilization. The Irishman who clamors against English oppression, and votes against the equal right of the negro in America and of the Secularist in England, has not "hitched his wagon to the star" destined to ascend. The best service of the Fenian, the supplanted landlord, is indirect; he is a mirror of the English landlord who has supplanted him, and whose equal violence is systematized in the forms of law. It is clan contending with clan. The English and Scottish common people are slowly comprehending this; and behind all expedients of the hour, there steadily advances the movement for land-nationalization,—the *baculus Jhesu* turned to a Golden Rod that shall swallow all the rods and the serpents that plague these fair islands.

MONCURE D. CONWAY.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOARD OF TRADE MORALITY.

A FAMILIAR example of a corner in grain is seen when a clique of merchants have bought up so many of their fellow merchants' contracts for future delivery, and at the same time have gained control of so much of the grain actually in hand, that those who have made the contracts are unable to buy at the price stipulated when the grain is deliverable. A "squeeze" results, and the cornered merchants must pay to the clique the difference between the price named in the contract and the price current at the time prescribed for delivery. The sum thus paid, less the loss that may arise on the sale of the "cash grain" purchased while sustaining the corner, constitutes the profits of the corner. While the contracts were out, those who had issued them were interested in keeping prices down, and were "bearing" the market. Those who held the contracts would naturally "bull" the market. The former would spread before the public all evidences that the supply was in excess of the demand. The latter would labor to prove that demand exceeded supply. The rise in price incident to such a corner would have a natural tendency to cause an inflow, from the points of production, of large quantities of the article cornered, into the point of distribution, and to stop its export or shipment. Both these influences would swell the immediate supply, thus tending to "break" the corner, and send the price below the figure named in the contract. These influences would have to be counteracted by the "bulls" buying promptly all incoming grain, and all "futures" offered, to run down the market. This is the perpetual battle which determines the daily and hourly quotations of grain. The conflict of these rival hosts gives rise to the uproar and bedlam of the grain exchange.

If the inflow of grain, or the abundant capital and confidence of the "bears," or the removal of some cause of scarcity, such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as war, drought, floods, bad seasons abroad, or other cause, break the corner, then the prices fall, the cornering clique lose, and pay the difference.

The merchants who have issued agreements to take wheat in future have "gone long," those who have issued the agreements to deliver have "sold short." These futures bear a relation to the actual grain on hand, like that which a credit currency bears to the coin in which it is redeemable. They may be many times greater in quantity, and they can be dealt in with a rapidity and dexterity unknown in sales by inspection and delivery, or by sample. It is this tendency of the futures to an exaggerated volume that makes corners possible, just as the tendency of banks to inflation may, under certain circumstances, cause suspension of redemption.

"Options," "privileges," or puts and calls, cut a subordinate figure, and, in an economic sense, none whatever. They are the mere purchase of "refusals," as they would be styled in real estate and other trades. Since the legislatures and courts have condemned them, they have ceased in Chicago, except as after hours a dealer may for a small bonus buy the privilege of putting on another 10,000 bushels of October wheat, or *vice versa*, of calling on him for it, in which case it is a mere debt of honor to the close of the next day.

To prevent corners it would be necessary to confine the purchase and sale of grain to that in sight and deliverable. This would preclude all foresight and prescience, and forbid any standard of prices, admixture of the grains of various owners, and any selling of grain by grade. Corners become inevitable the moment forecast in grain dealing is made possible.

They are not necessarily preconcerted nor intentional. If a speculator thinks, as Keene did in 1879, that a wet season in England will send wheat up, after harvest, to $1.35, and he therefore, before harvest, buys 5,000,000 bushels at $1.10, deliverable in October, and if Chicago speculators think Keene has overestimated the potency of British dampness, they may make a rush to sell him all he wants. He buys to protect the price at which he has already bought. His own purchases run up the price toward the figure at which he aims, and seem to justify his forecast. He buys up to 15,000,000 bushels, all that the Chicago elevators will hold. He buys at $1.15, and all the way up to $1.35. He has, therefore, two chances of loss. The small quan-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tity he has purchased — 15,000,000 bushels — is a mere bagatelle in the wheat market of the world, the lowest American production being 380,000,000 bushels. If he has mistaken the effect of British dampness, he is gone. The wheat market of the world is too big a thing to be cornered, unless it corners itself by a short supply. October will show whether he acted with prescience or presumption. If with prescience, wheat will not rush in, and the price will stand. If with presumption, it will break. His puny 15,000,000 bushels are powerless against the 800,000,000 bushels which he doesn't hold. His one chance of profit is the sum he squeezes out of those who have "sold short" on his "futures." His two chances of loss are that he must himself sell out much "cash wheat" at a decline, and that prices may never reach the figure at which he has aimed.

Visitors who look at the babel of a Board of Trade only to be bewildered by its din and tumult, and whose personal occupations are concerned with but few persons and small sums, stand appalled at the breakneck rate at which fortunes are lost and won in grain, and at the fluctuations of its apparent values. It matters not whether the article dealt in be the relative values of gold and paper, or grain, cotton, stocks and shares, consols, rentes, bonds or petroleum: they see in the transactions one element which is present in gambling, viz., sudden and immeasurably vast gains and losses. To see the utilities of such transactions, requires a profounder insight into the methods and harmonies of trade than they can be expected to have. They denounce the entire practice as gambling, and forthwith organize some form of campaign for its abolition, or at least stand ready at all convenient times to denounce it on ethical grounds.

The only standard by which we can test these contracts is that of utility. Do their benefits outweigh their mischiefs? Are the complaints against them founded in want of information and want of thought? If so, they are beneficent; and if beneficent, then in every ethical analysis they are right. Hostile legislation cannot make them wrong, and is very likely to demonstrate only its own futility. The advantages of future contracts in grain, founded on the system of grading grain in bulk, and issuing warehouse receipts for certain quantities of certain grades and buying and selling these receipts, as compared with the only alternative system of selling grain

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by sample, or on view, are so great that it is not too much to say that to provision the civilized world, without the aid of such mechanism, would be found hardly less difficult than to transport to market the world's food material without the aid of railways.

The first function of this mechanism is to fix an authoritative price for grain, which is telegraphed every morning to all parts of the world, so that every producer and purchaser gets the quotation with his morning paper and as often during the day as he wishes. This service imports into the production and transfer of the commodity a certainty, rapidity, and economy which contrast strongly with the expense of finding out values, the confusion, imposition, chicane, overreaching, and fraud incident to the trade in the various goods which can be sold only by sample or present view, without grading, or any of the means of fixing a price which pertain to the trade in grain.

Mr. James McCreery, a leading representative of the New York dry goods trade, testified before the Tariff Commission:

"I have been engaged in the dry goods business thirty-six years, twenty-nine years on my own account, and during that time have imported large quantities of goods. Yet I find it extremely difficult at the present time to tell within ten or fifteen per cent. what is the real value of fine goods. I go to Europe frequently and spend two or three months at a time there purchasing goods, and yet I find it difficult to come any nearer than I have stated to the value of certain goods."

There will often be from ten to thirty per cent. difference in the price of goods of the same value between different dealers in the same city, in clothing, furniture, dry goods, works of art, carriages, books, watches and jewelry,—in short, nearly every commodity whose price, or the price of whose immediate raw material, is not fought over and settled between two antagonistic sets of speculators on some Board of Trade. Yet every farmer and manufacturer knows daily, as to grain, exactly what Mr. McCreery cannot discover, by spending three months in Europe, as to dry goods. They know not merely within fifteen per cent., but within one-eighth of one per cent., the exact selling value of every variety of grain or provisions, cotton, petroleum, government bonds or railway shares, in any and all the markets of civilization. They know that millions of dollars are staked in behalf of a rise in price, and an equal number of millions in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

favor of a fall, and that the actual price quoted is the precise point at which these millions balance. They know that the published quotation is one not fixed by the arbitrary determination of any one dealer, but by the aggregate verdict of them all. The grain baron who knows to a fraction the amount of grain in sight or coming, and who stands ready to buy by the million bushels, and the ostler who invests five dollars in a "bucket shop" on a point, or for luck, are both represented in that quotation, as the attractive forces of the mountain and the pebble are felt in just proportion to their weight in every moment of the earth's diurnal revolution. Hence, throughout the world, all who buy or sell trust to that quotation as their standard, and sell within half of one per cent. of it, allowing for freights and charges.

If there were fifteen per cent. of uncertainty as to the price, the producer would probably lose twelve per cent. of the fifteen. This twelve per cent. on every sale is a probable estimate of the value of the Board of Trade to the farmer. But if grain had to be bought by sample, on personal inspection and delivery, it would require an incalculable increase in the number of grain merchants and in the quantity of capital required to handle it; also in the space required for storage and in the cost of transfer, a much larger number of buyers and sellers, and a proportionately obstructive tax in the shape of commissions on the production, trade, and consumption, all of which would result in giving the consumer less for his money. The customs of trade are forced upon traders by their economy, and because he who falls in with them does more for less cost than he who refuses to accept them. Hence, every quirk and "wrinkle" in the grain trade is an economy of capital, time, or labor.

The intrinsic difficulty of fixing a value upon wheat, cotton, or petroleum, is as great as to do the same for dry goods, clothing, or jewelry. In the absence of boards of trade, not only would the margin of doubt and variance as to values be at least fifteen per cent., but a doubt or variance to this extent would check production probably to the extent of forty per cent. Such a service to production places a gulf between the strifes of the Board of Trade and gambling, as wide as that which divides plowing or reaping from faro or three-card monte.

"Futures" and "options" render a second service to commerce in steadying the market as between different dates, which indeed

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is the logical sequence of their operation in imparting uniformity, throughout the world, to the prices at which grain is sold in different places, and by different persons, at the same time. The ultimate criterion which determines the validity of prices is the ratio of the supply to the demand. The speculator who can neither be successfully cornered himself, nor beaten on a corner when he forms one against others, is he who judges rightly concerning this ratio. If the normal consumption of wheat for the population of the United States be five bushels per capita per annum, while the surplus which Europe can take at $1 per bushel is 200,000,000 bushels, an American wheat crop of 550,000,000 bushels presents a surplus of 100,000,000 bushels of supply over demand. Hence, the price must go below $1; and he who combines or "bulls" to force the price up to $1.10, or even to hold it at $1, is simply presumptuous. If he offers to take wheat at those rates for any considerable period of time, the interests of commerce and the rights of consumers require that he shall be "squeezed" and, if he persists, ruined, as a punishment for fighting against natural law. In the case of the Keene wheat deal of 1879, the proof is now clear that he operated against the natural law of prices, by underestimating the capacity of the American supply rather than by overestimating the extent of the English deficiency. By expanding our export of wheat from 152,075,000 bushels in 1878–9 to 176,426,000 bushels in 1879–80, and our export of corn from 79,031,000 bushels to 103,450,000 bushels, with a like increase from India and elsewhere, the deficiency was filled without any serious rise in price. Hence his corner broke. So of the recent McGeogh lard deal. McGeogh assumed with lard at eight cents that it would go to eleven or thirteen. But the sources of supply for lard are almost inexhaustible, and with lard at nine or ten cents, hogs could be transformed into lard faster than he could pay for them. Hence his attempted corner failed, the farmers meanwhile getting good prices, which came wholly out of McGeogh, and the Board of Trade crushing his presumption in the interests of consumers of lard. There is no more chance in the operation of the law of supply and demand than in gravitation. He who buys or sells, therefore, with an adequate expert knowledge of the conditions which control prices, plays less a game of chance than he who builds his mill by a stream and expects its waters to turn his wheels and grind his grist. The minimum of losses

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

occurs to those who combine the best knowledge of the sources of supply and avenues of demand with the shrewdest sense and judgment as to all the collateral causes which concur to modify, qualify, and retard this main force. If the rise and fall of prices were determined by blind chance, or by causes as impossible to foresee as the deal in cards or the throw in dice, then to invest with reference to them would be gambling. If the money invested in margins on the purchase of optional grain contracts were of no utility in commerce, except to indicate the owner's faith in a certain course of the market, then the transaction might be classed with bets. But the aggregate funds invested on either side in grain options do, for the time, hold the market to its price, and constitute the investor a part owner, vested or contingent, in the aggregate stock of grain on hand. If he has invested on the "bear" side, then his little $5 or $100 lends its featherweight to depress prices and increase the export. If he is on the "bull" side, then he is stimulating the farmers to sell, and is checking the export. Both are part owners, vested or contingent, of the grain on hand. It matters little whether one man goes into the market with $10,000,000 or 100,000 men go in with $100 each, or 1,000,000 men with $10 each, if they invest on the same side of the market and with a like sagacity, a like conformity to the law of prices, and a like pluck and reserve of capital behind them. On what data can we base the assertion that the influence of the smallest sum on either side of the scale is lost in determining the quotation or in influencing the movement of grain? If on none, then, in an economic sense, this utility distinguishes the investment wholly from any sort of bet.

If the ratio of the supply to the demand be such that wheat must go up, the sooner that is known, and the greater the number of persons to whom it is known, the more gradual will be its rise, and the more evenly will the profits of the rise be diffused among all the holders of grain. But if the rise is factitious, or its grounds fallacious, then the sooner the bubble is pricked the better for all. In the main, the whole capital invested in grain resists false rumors, false conclusions, and false judgments as to prices, and, in the main, the daily losses on the board are the penalties paid for misconceiving the market, an error which, if allowed to run on, tends constantly to more violent fluctuations in prices and to greater individual losses.

A third service performed by futures is to effect a movement

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of capital from the manufacturers and consumers, through the grain board, to the shippers and farmers, in advance always of the consumption, often of the transportation, and sometimes even in advance of the complete production of the grain. In such case, these futures perform the same function that drafts, drawn by a consignor on a consignee against goods shipped and *in transitu*, perform in commerce. They advance the capital of the consumer to the producer on the credit of the shipment. If an Eastern manufacturer desires to know the price at which he can supply himself with wheat from four to six months hence, as a means of imparting firmness and safety to his own operations, he buys a "future" authorizing him to call for grain at the periods desired. The commission merchant, before selling the future, protects himself by a purchase at such a rate as to leave a fair profit. If his purchase is based on contracts with farmers, as it must be, directly or indirectly, if it calls for an article not yet in market, then the margin advanced by the manufacturer passes through the commission merchant to the farmer, and the case is essentially as if the latter had shipped directly to the manufacturer and then drawn a draft against the shipment.

Formerly, in the case of cotton, the means advanced in London and New York on these "futures" found their way to the planter himself in time to assist in the marketing, and even in the production of the crop. In the older of our Western states the farmers are generally too "fore-handed" to desire any advance, or to put a price on their crops, until they are ready to ship. But on the extreme frontiers where men are handling a great deal of land with little capital, it is still done. "Cash paid for wheat," the invariable sign throughout Western towns, indicates that the stream of capital which flows backward from the manufacturing consumer to the producer, is ready to meet the farmer everywhere at his door, and from thence to float the golden harvest into the market. If it were possible to reduce all sales of grain in Chicago to sales accompanied by actual delivery, then wheat could only be paid for in cash in the country to the extent of the surplus cash of the commission merchant who purchases. This would generally be *nil*. Hence the legend of the wheat buyer in the rural towns would be "Wheat bought on one to three months' time." The cash for the various commodities not dealt in by futures or on boards of trade, such as iron and steel, clothing, furniture, books,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

jewelry, dry goods, etc., does not reach the producer until three or four months after the product leaves his hands. The same was true of the grain trade before it was handled by boards of trade, whose inseparable incidents are the blending of all shipments into one graded bulk, the issue of certificates for the grain as graded, future contracts calling for these certificates, margins, and finally corners.

It may be conceded that these benefits cost. All that has value in civilization costs. Railroads cost in loss of life. At times, banks have cost, until the most popular thing a demagogue could do was to oppose banks. Ocean steamers cost in heart-rending calamities. Government, freedom, law, all cost. It is needless to inquire, therefore, whether it is more true that boards of trade encourage the gambling spirit, by sending men whose nerves are exhausted by a whole day of feverish gains and losses in corn, to seek a continuation of the like excitement in a night of faro; or whether they divert from mischievous into useful channels the propensity for the fierce strifes and feverish gains of the play-room. It is barely possible they may so wed the most dangerous of passions to utility as to make it the faithful servant of the world's best good. A class of contracts which perform such services to commerce, which promote the production of the staff of life and cheapen bread and provisions throughout the civilized world, whose profits rest on economic law and not on blind chance, which give equality and firmness to the prices they are charged with disturbing, can only be belittled into bets or likened to the gaming table, by those whose knowledge of business is that of children. Their cost, if the account of their benefits have a debit side at all, is not to be placed in comparison with their beneficence.

The country has recently witnessed with dismay the entrance into the lists of a bold trooper, the Chevalier Henry D. Lloyd, who has ridden up and down through the crowded marts of the grain exchange, clad in the full armor of a financial reformer, with visor down and lance at rest, wearing spurs as big as mill wheels, and has gored and charged so furiously to the right and left with his bare bodkin, that any man who hereafter buys or sells an option in grain will certainly wish he had been robbing an orphan. The charm of Mr. Lloyd's style lies in the trick of granting you all the facts essential to your acquittal on any one accusation, while overwhelming you with such a multifarious hoard of new and unproved accusations, and with such

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a vigor of pathos, denunciation, epithet, and entreaty, that before a hasty court, like that of public opinion, one feels doubtful whether it may not be necessary to send for the priest before he has time to send for his witnesses.

Nothing could be more satisfactory than the candor with which Mr. Lloyd seems to admit the beneficence of the Board of Trade's work, before proceeding to ask sentence of death against its promoters, because the fingers of the children are burned with the sparks that fly from its anvil. He concedes that, a hundred years ago, men had to fight against the popular sense of right for the privilege of buying grain at all to sell again, for the "popular sense of right" then said that every man who buys grain to sell again adds his profit to its price, and therefore necessarily makes bread dear. He concedes that the "popular sense of right" a hundred years ago was a very ignorant affair, and charged the agency of the middleman with making bread dear, when in fact the middle-man was doing more than any other to make it cheap. After thus showing that the "popular sense of right" of a century ago was an uninstructed idiot, utterly incapable of even thinking soberly about the grain trade, he prescribes, as a cure for the supposed evils of the present grain trade, a system of national regulation by this same "popular sense of right," *i. e.*, by a submission of questions, which they have no means of comprehending, to a general convention of the non-experts in Congress assembled.

Mr. Lloyd styles Boards of Trade vast "establishments for the manufacture of prices,"—"concentrations of news, capital, and middle-men, in a focus,"—"legislatures, whose enactments are prices," and "more than negative registers of prices determined by a conflux of forces external to them." In short, he looks upon them as clocks which, at most periods, may merely record the time, but charges that they once in awhile step outside their province and actually create the time. He thinks they are barometers that once in a while create the storm which they ought only to indicate. If this be true, it is a grave offense; I regret that Mr. Lloyd, with the great resources at his command, disdains to perceive that the proof of one such accusation would make him immortal in philosophy, for it would establish that there is a portion of the universe not governed by law.

The means of proof are plain. He has only to show that, in one instance, when the supply exceeded the demand and economic law required that prices should fall, a corner formed to send

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prices up reaped a splendid harvest of profit, in spite of the ineffectual efforts of farmers to forward their crops in time to break the corner, and in spite of the efforts of news collectors to prove to capitalists and dealers that the corner was fighting against economic law.

A survey of all the facts showing that, in the case of one distinct corner, those who relied on "brute wealth" were able to speculate against the economic law (that excess of supply over demand must reduce, excess of demand over supply must raise prices) would be worth whole columns of verbal efflorescence and camp-meeting rhetoric. Before we get up an indignation meeting against Jehovah, because the sun stood still for a day to enable the Israelites to slaughter their enemies, let us settle the little question as to whether the sun did stand still.

Mr. Lloyd is not specific about dates. He speaks of a corner in 1879–1880–1881 and 1882, although he tells us there are corners all the time. Somewhere among these we are to locate the following incident:

"At one time their wheat was piled up in the elevators and on the railroad tracks, intentionally stopping the way so that no other wheat could be got to market by the farmers and dealers. Wheat was refused to exporters at prices they could afford to pay. The English buyers went to Bombay and Calcutta; and the East Indies, which sent their first sample to Liverpool less than ten years ago, have, in consequence, taken a place next to us in supplying the British market. During the winter, four hundred vessels lay for months in New York harbor, the owners pleading for wheat even at ruinously low rates (of freight). Many of them ran into debt, and the majority of them had to sail away to seek cargoes elsewhere."

All this is breezily connected by Mr. Lloyd with the date of 1879. But alas, in 1879, instead of the steamers rotting at our wharves without cargoes, by reason of the grain being piled up in Chicago, we exported by far the largest quantity we have ever exported in any one year, being 176,426,000 bushels of wheat, and 103,450,000 bushels of corn, or fifteen times more than all our Chicago elevators could hold. If the wheat was piled up and blocked in 1879, it must have been for lack of cars and vessels to take it away as fast as it was forwarded. Our exports of that year compare with those of other years as follows, from September 1st to August 31st of each year:

	Wheat, bu.	*Corn, bu.*
1882–1883	125,402,000	45,114,000
1881–1882	125,705,000	26,290,000
1880–1881	159,975,000	83,370,000
1879–1880	176,426,000	103,450,000
1878–1879	152,075,000	79,031,000

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A careful examination will show that this and the crisis in railroad freights, which immediately followed, occurred late in 1881, after the short crop of that year had made it apparent not only to our shrewdest grain buyers, but to all the world, that we were short by 700,000,000 bushels, as compared with the crop of the previous year.

It was in this winter, following the short crop of 1881, that Mr. Chauncey M. Depew testified in other language, before the committee of the New York Legislature, to the same supposed "fact" which Mr. Lloyd is above describing. Mr. Depew said:

"At the present time the grain at Chicago is controlled by a combination which has so raised the price that it is selling for less in Liverpool than here, and the encouragement to the grain interests of Liverpool has been such that new sources of supply have been discovered which will in future compete with this country."

Evidently Mr. Lloyd and Mr. Depew are "cornering" the same fact, and Mr. Depew's testimony fixes it as an event occurring while he was testifying, which was in the winter of 1881–2, after our short crop of 1881. In fact, this was the only occasion on which wheat vessels left our ports in the manner described without being able to get cargoes.

Did the state of the supply and demand justify the high prices in Chicago, and the consequent withholding of wheat and corn from export? Let us see. The corn produced in 1881, in the United States, had been only 1,194,916,000 bushels, as against 1,754,861,535 bushels in 1880—a falling off in Indian corn alone of 559,945,535 bushels. Our total export of corn in 1880, with an abundant crop, had been 98,169,877 bushels, or only one-fifth as much as the shortage in the crop of 1881. We must either have imported corn from abroad, or used less corn than the year preceding by nearly 500,000,000 bushels. And yet both Mr. Depew and Mr. Lloyd pathetically assure us, with every variety of rhetorical cadence, that any rise in corn on this account was due to manipulation and artificial "cornering," which should be suppressed by national regulation. Hence, if we had had a board of national regulation, and Depew and Lloyd had been members of it, they would have concurred in sending corn out of the country in the year 1881, although the shortage in our crop was then five times greater than our usual annual export. Surely if the design of these gentlemen had been to prove that any attempt at national regulation, so long as the present degree of capacity for misapprehension concerning the economics of the grain market

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lasts, would be a public nuisance, they could not have made their testimony so emphatic by design as they have done by inadvertence.

Our wheat crop in that year had fallen from 459,479,505 bushels in 1880, according to the census, to 380,280,000 bushels in 1881, according to Bradstreet's. Here was a decline in our production of 79,199,505 bushels, while our export of wheat and wheat flour in 1880 was 159,264,214 bushels, thus showing that the decline in production would compel a cutting down of one-half in our export, without allowing for the additional diminution of wheat export which would necessarily be caused by shortage in the other cereal crops.

The theory that the Chicago Board of Trade developed the Indian supply of wheat would, if true, defeat the charge contained in Mr. Lloyd's caption of "making bread dear." It would show them to be the most efficient of all philanthropists, as, in fact, on other grounds they are in making bread cheap. The charge contains more poetry than truth. The English had built 2500 miles of canal and immense railways in order to develop this wheat culture in India, beginning twenty years before the Chicago Board held on so tightly to the crop of 1881. We think the English did it.

Nor do we admit that the Board made bread dear in England by holding on to the crop of 1881 for a time. For the ruling English price was 5*s.* 11*d.* per bushel in 1881, or $1.47. The price American producers got for it, according to Mr. Nimmo, was $1.19. If we let it go 26 cents below the English price, then Mr. Depew's guess, that it was higher in Chicago than in Liverpool, did not define the average but some exceptional fact. Meanwhile, the American farmer got for the export of 1881, which was 118,000,000 bushels, $1.19; whereas, for the larger crop of 1880, he got only 95 cents, and for that of 1882 only $1.03. The difference between what the Board of Trade gave him for the exports, and what Depew and Lloyd would have given him, was therefore 24 cents a bushel, or say $28,320,000.

Instead, therefore, of denouncing the natural and beneficent workings of enlightened self-interest which detained the wheat, corn, and provisions in this country, through the "speculations," and with the capital of the Board of Trade, gentlemen so enlightened as Mr. Depew and Mr. Lloyd should long since have discovered their utility. Had the wheat and corn been permitted to go abroad in concession to their demands, they would only have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

been brought back by the prices here being carried up to what the tearfully rhetorical class of weeping economists would call the "famine pitch."

Mr. Lloyd concedes that a great many, perhaps a majority, of the farmers believe that, to them, corners are beneficial. Test, for once, the validity of their faith in the case of this particular corner so feelingly denounced by Depew and Lloyd. The Department of Agriculture reports that, for the seven abundant crops of 1880, viz.: corn, wheat, oats, barley, rye, buckwheat, and potatoes, an aggregate of 2,885,853,071 bushels brought only $1,442,559,918, while for the same seven short crops of 1881, aggregating only 2,175,175,064 bushels, the farmers got $1,570,248,541. In short, for a crop less by 710,677,007 bushels in 1881, the farmers got more by $127,688,623 than for the more abundant crop of 1880. Hence the farmers were not far astray in this instance. Mr. Lloyd gracefully admits that the Board of Trade "mobilizes and cashes the crops of the Mississippi valley." He could hardly say more in behalf of the sun which causes them to germinate and fructify. It "brings the capital of the Bank of England and the Hopes of Amsterdam to meet the farmer when he drives up to the country station with a wagon load of grain to sell." If so, it does well. Very few missionaries or professional philanthropists, who make a living by doing good with other people's money, could do better.

Of "futures" he says that it is by their agency alone that a commercial crisis is prevented every year, and that Senator Hoar's proposal to stop trading in futures, if enacted, would produce an annual panic. But Senator Hoar, who comes from a State where no grain is dealt in, is the most intelligent of the national grain-sale regulators, as Mr. Reagan, who comes from Texas, where there are few railroads, is the most vigorous of the regulators of railways. It is the surplus spinsters in Massachusetts who are most zealous to regulate polygamy in Utah, and the nullifying planters of South Carolina, who never bought, used, or saw a pound of pig-iron, who are most alarmed about the duty on that article, which none but iron manufacturers pay.

It was John Brown, who had never seen a slave, nor a master, nor a plantation, who at fourteen years of age saw a free negro whipped with an iron rod by a citizen of a free State, 300 miles away from the slave line, and forthwith swore a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

great oath that he would kindly deliver the entire slave race, of whose condition he knew nothing, into the condition of the free negro, whose suffering excited his pity, without maturing his feeble logical faculties. Thus it is that the genius for national regulation always inspires people to begin with those matters of which they know least, and to abhor all explanation of things which if they come to understand they could not denounce. Thus it is that national regulation may often mean the national bedevilment of complex questions, through the forcible application to them of the crude notions of the presumptuous non-experts, whose only qualification for dealing with them is that they live so far away from them that they have no means of discovering the utilities that lie hidden under supposed evils, or the destructiveness involved in their fancied remedies. Mr. Lloyd should be cautious how he recommends that the planters of Texas and cotton-spinners of Massachusetts receive national license to hurl a brick or a bowlder at the delicate machinery of our Western grain trade in the name of reform, when neither of them would know how to go upon the board and buy 10,000 bushels of wheat.

Mr. Lloyd says, "These corners put prices down when the farmer wants to sell, and put them up when the miller needs to buy." Surely this is not instructive. It is not merely "*sans-culotte*"*-ish*; it is "sand-lot"-ish. It is simply rant. We have farmers whose single crops of wheat alone range at from 50,000 to 1,000,000 bushels. I have known farmers in Illinois who, twenty years ago, would hold their crops of maize three years to get their price. Farmers, therefore, choose their own time for selling, and take the whole year to choose from. Mr. Lloyd admits this elsewhere, in saying of the Board that, "with all its faults, it is the finest piece of mechanism commerce has yet invented, and without it the American farmer could not retain his command of almost antipodal markets." If it is the American farmer who commands the Liverpool market, then the market cannot command the farmer.

Mr. Lloyd thinks it a grievous hardship that the Board of Trade should be left by the courts to be a law unto itself, and especially since the tribunals established within the board may include members who have interests in the very disputes they are called on to decide.

He assumes that in the courts there would be a total escape from these evils. Far from it. Those who have had most to do

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with courts of law best apprehend the extent of their unsatisfactoriness. The sphere of their actual usefulness is extremely limited. They are the surviving relic of the old effort to rule society by organized force as a substitute for anarchic individual physical force. But trade cannot be forced. Its inherent nature claims freedom — not necessarily the freedom of foreign producers to trade in our markets untaxed, a travesty on true freedom of trade, but freedom from the coercive intrusions and blunders of non-experts in trade, freedom to follow the guidance of interest and the inducement of profit, freedom even to err and blunder, and to pay in losses out of one's own pocket the penalties of the error.

A church, a Masonic organization, a base-ball club, a theatrical company, a manufacturing establishment, and even a family enjoys a system of law of its own as distinctly removed from the interference of courts as is that of the Board of Trade. All these have a sphere of interior administration, in which it may be said they take their stand outside the law. A membership in either of these might come to have a pecuniary value. Yet it would be the height of absurdity for a court to attempt to sell such a membership for debt, or to enforce the election, by the other members of such an organization, of any new member whom a retiring member might desire to substitute in his stead. The abolition of just such a system of selling commissions in the British army and navy, forms one of the whitest plumes that grace the helmet of Gladstone as a reformer. But Mr. Lloyd weeps because what has just been abolished in the British army and navy as an abuse, cannot be introduced on our boards of trade as a reform. Board of Trade men cannot be more ignorant of law or of the rules of evidence than lawyers, legislatures, and judges generally are of the economics of trade and business.

Shall I stop to discuss the appalling assumption involved in Mr. Lloyd's title "Making Bread Dear"? Must economic teachers, like Spanish bull-fighters, forever enter the arena of economic discussion with these socialistic red rags in one hand, as if society were a mad bull that must be made to glare with rage before the lance's point could let in light upon his brain? Will the time never come when such irritating captions will cease to be placed over an unproved indictment?

VAN BUREN DENSLOW.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HISTORIES OF THE FRENCH REVOLUTION.

THE most momentous epoch in all modern history has found, as was natural, a continual series of historians; but, up to the present time, it has found no one that is finally sufficient. Almost every writer in France, and most of those out of it, who have given us histories of the Revolution, have some theory to maintain, some party to support, or some hero to glorify. A party view or a special view of this complex series of movements is, of necessity, a wrong view. To have a theory about the Revolution is as hopeless a hobby as to have a theory about Shakespeare, the Catholic Church, or the female sex. Parties have not much more to do with the Revolution than they have with the course of civilization. The drama of it has no hero, no moral, and no definite catastrophe. He who knows the Revolution best will be the last to go to it for heroes, ideals, or examples.

I can remember at college that a foolish youth proposed to discuss at the debating society "If the French Revolution were a justifiable proceeding?" And thereupon a fantastic, but most acute scholar, asked him if he thought the fall of man a justifiable proceeding? There was a profound meaning in his grim jest. There is about the French Revolution that precise character of portentous moment to the human race, of utter inevitableness, of rash self-confidence, leading us through generations of suffering to a higher life by heroism, just as there is about the old-world myth of the fall of our first parents from Paradise. It launched us, for all ages to come, for better or for worse, on that career of toil, self-improvement, and ultimate regeneration, much as the imagination of Hebrew prophets of old saw man committed to work out the problem of his life, in the old books of Moses. The Revolution is the story of man's civilization in its final problem, just as the fall represented to the first religious

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thinkers the crisis of man's earliest answer to the first great problem of his life.

What an epoch has that Revolution been in human history! How completely has every form of our social life changed since the famous opening of the States General in 1789! The pre-revolutionary epoch is not older than some men still living, and yet how distant it is from us morally and socially. The ancient regimen is as far from us as the Middle Ages. Read that brilliant installment of a life of Fox, by Mr. Trevelyan, and reflect on the gulf which separates our society to-day from theirs before the Revolution. How coolly men of rank assume the monopoly of government; how profligate, how unblushing, how reckless is the career of the high-born and the wealthy! From the fall of the Roman empire till the proclamation of the republic (*i.e.*, for twelve centuries) "gentlemen," as they loved to be called, had gone always armed, at least when in full dress. M. Grévy is, perhaps, the only ruler of a great European state who has never worn a sword in his life. An aristocracy was the basis of society; privileges of birth and of landed estates were recognized in all countries of Europe. Law, manners, industry, church, state, in many things of external form, and in some of internal substance, were mediæval. The interval which separates us from them is like that which divides the world of antiquity from the world of Christendom. Well might Auguste Comte make it in his Calendar the date of a new era.

When we come to see into its depths, the most inadequate view of the Revolution that we can form is, that it is a mere outbreak, an insurrection, a period of anarchy between two regular periods of calm. Again, one of the most favorite and yet shallow ideas is this: That it had some specific cause—that it was caused by the corrupt state of the monarchy or of the aristocracy, or by a vicious system of government, or a vicious land system, or by popular ignorance, or by skeptical philosophy, or by the want of local self-government and of parliamentary institutions. All of these things contributed to it; each formed one of the many causes, as did fifty other things. But no one of them was the single cause.

Next to seeking for a cause, when cause there is none, one of the most admired fallacies is the seeking for a beginning and an end to the Revolution. Some make it begin with the States General in 1789, others with Louis XV. and Voltaire. Some go

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

back as far as Louis XIV. and the building of Versailles. In truth, the Revolution is the outcome of forces which had been gathering in intensity for centuries, of which the Renascence of the fifteenth century, and the Reformation of the sixteenth century, and the revolutions and rebellions of the seventeenth century were all parts. M. Michelet, alone among historians, sees this—for he begins his history of the Revolution with Dante and Huss, the thinkers of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. And as the Revolution had no precise beginning any more than modern society had any precise beginning, so the Revolution has had no precise end. Its end is not yet arrived. We who have seen the insurrections in Paris in 1830, in 1848, in 1871, who remember the portentous surging in Europe of 1848 and 1849, who have seen German Socialism, and French Red Republicanism, and Russian Nihilism, who see to-day a sister island of our own people in a state that reminds us of some of the gloomier years of the last century,—how can we believe that the Revolution has yet found its end and its normal issue? There could be, I think, no more instructive page of history than this,—it is a page yet to be written. I mean that whereon should be drawn out the connection between the taking of the Bastile, in 1789, and the European movement of 1848 and the European movement of 1871. It is a page that has yet to be written, but the thought of it and all that it will contain may prevent us from dreaming that the French Revolution is ended.

The true reason why the French Revolution is not ended is this—that it was far more constructive than destructive, that permanent changes grew up amidst all the confusion and bloodshed such as have a large career of development before them. It would be easy to show that the last fifty years of the eighteenth century was a period more fertile in constructive effort, gave us more germs of new social institutions, than any similar period of fifty years in the history of mankind. When we take France, when we take Europe of to-day, and compare them with France and Europe of one hundred years ago, in government, in law, in industrial organization, in popular education, in religious earnestness, in moral standard, in the whole social system, we find the most amazing contrast. And this new social system did not come hap-hazard. It has been slowly built up. out of thoughts, and efforts, and discoveries that were all carefully worked out some one hundred to one hundred and fifty years

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and more ago. Truly we may call the Revolution the crisis of modern reconstruction:

> "When France in wrath her giant limbs upreared,
> And with that oath, which smote air, earth, and sea,
> Stamped her strong foot, and said she would be free."

And now to turn to the question, how, in what books, is this wonderful epoch to be studied? So much has been written about it that, practically, knowledge is in danger of being darkened instead of enlightened. An immense library might be made out of works relating to the Revolution. There are at least a score of formal histories of it, in more or less repute. Unfortunately, a great many of these histories are written, not so much to teach us the facts as to indoctrinate us with theories, usually very one-sided theories, of politics and society, to puff up or, as it is now the fashion to call it, to "rehabilitate" a bad man, to make a hero, to blacken a party, to defend an institution,—in fact, to do us good in various ways, instead of giving us true information about real events. All of these are necessarily wrong. There is no hero in the French Revolution, and no literary skill can read one into it; there is no party, no institution in it either perfectly black or perfectly white, and the grand lesson of all in the Revolution is, not to surrender ourselves to any party.

We may divide the various accounts of this epoch as follows: 1, real narratives; 2, personal gossip, or recollections (and the recollections are very often inventions of the rememberer); 3, historical poems; 4, historical romances, or political diatribes. Unluckily, the narratives are apt to get dull, the personal memoirs rather scrappy and egotistical, the poems extremely unintelligible, and the romances and diatribes extremely mendacious. The best of the plain narratives, I take, beyond all question, to be the history of Mignet. Poems, such as the dramas of Mr. Carlyle and of Jules Michelet, are magnificent works of imagination and of description, but they are to most readers perfectly obscure until they are explained by a mass of prose commentary. Again, if we were to believe all that we find in Lamartine, or Louis Blanc, we should get a very distorted view. Lamartine's so-called histories are mere historical novels. It is far too little to say that Lamartine never shows any sort of desire for historical truth. His plan is deliberately to prefer

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

melodramatic effect to reality; an epigram to an authority; a fabulous coincidence to a true date.

We want, to begin with, a plain, unvarnished narrative of these great events, and the best, I say, beyond all question, is that by M. Mignet. It is plain, clear, interesting, judicious, and honest. It takes no side and has no hero; in one small volume it covers about thirty or forty years of the most stirring epoch of modern times; it is translated into English; it is one of the commonest of books. Mignet, however, only just gives us the bare outline; it is little more than a summary—but a very good summary. So far as the general history of Europe and the twenty-three years war is concerned, I do not know that we can do better than go to a work quite as well known, I mean "Alison's History of Europe." We cannot honestly say that Sir Archibald has given us a real history of Europe, nor recommend any but a real glutton in books to go to work on the twenty octavo volumes. For a clear summary, perhaps we cannot do better than go to the "Epitome of Alison's History of Europe," so far as we need a clear, succinct, and comprehensive history of the great war. With Mignet and Alison as short handbooks we have, at any rate, a plain and lively sketch of all the principal facts. But this is only the skeleton of the matter.

And as to fuller histories we have them, one may say, by the score, each with its own strong feature, each disfigured by some great defect, most of them excessively long, and many of them requiring a body of other books to make them understood. There are in English, for instance, plenty of histories, of which Sir A. Alison's is the type, which record the Revolution from the point of view of Burke, which with vigorous description and broad color paint the whole story as a villainous insurrection against a gracious king and queen and a gallant aristocracy. Von Sybel is little more than a German Alison, the laborious tirade of a wrong-headed partisan, in which professorial erudition and *gründlichkeit* are, after all, a poor substitute for the readable narrative of the Scotch Tory. The narrative, again, of the French statesman Thiers is clear, brilliant, coherent. There is always an advantage in getting a history written by a man who has helped to make history; and his six volumes have the merit of taking us down from the time of Maurepas to 1799, or about twenty years. The history of the Revolution is not defaced to the same degree by that deliberate purpose of misrepresentation,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

by that passion for glorifying France and making a hero of Bonaparte, which defaces the "History of the Consulate." But M. Thiers is always more of the politician and the publicist than the pure historian; and we never feel ourselves in the hands of one of the truly patient investigators of facts; nay, we do not always feel in the hands of a man who is seeking to tell us the truth at all. With all this, for the lucidity of its style, the vigor of its pictures, and the practical grasp on the business of politics M. Thiers's work remains, perhaps, the plainest narrative of the time, and is certainly the one which is most read in France.

A far more really historical work is that by an old political opponent of M. Thiers,—the late M. Louis Blanc. In M. Louis Blanc's "History of the Revolution" we have a real investigation of facts, the patience of the born historian, an immense mastery of at least some parts of the problem, and an insight into the popular part in the Revolution which is almost unrivaled. Far inferior to the book of M. Thiers in energy and flow of narrative, inferior also in the living grasp on affairs of a born politician like M. Thiers, inferior in all the elements of mere popularity, M. L. Blanc stands out immeasurably superior to M. Thiers in the qualities of historical truth. In all that concerns the condition of the people, the democratic organization of Paris in its clubs and the sections, M. Blanc is perhaps unequaled. It is unfortunate that a work of such high merit is on such a vast scale that twelve not very lively volumes are devoted to the events of five years; and it is far more unfortunate (it is worse than unfortunate) that the whole work is ruined by the deliberate purpose to find the hero of the age in Robespierre, and at last to make the history itself a sort of apotheosis of that sanguinary tyrant, whom M. Blanc would have us believe was a gentle and inspired enthusiast.

Those who will seriously make a study of this epoch will go, of course, to the more detailed histories of special periods, such as Mortimer-Ternaux's "History of the Terror," Lanfrey's "History of Napoleon," Taine's and De Tocqueville's account of the Old Society.

A few words as to each of these. Of recent books none, I suppose, has done so much in the way of new investigation as the careful and patient work of Mortimer-Ternaux's "The History of the Terror." But, after all, few but special students of the Revolution will be able to go to these ponderous octavos for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the events of little more than a single year. We lose all sense of perspective if we suffer ourselves to regard the Revolution as a mere apotheosis of the guillotine, as a season of simple terror. Lanfrey, again, who in our day has finally demolished the Napoleonic legend, and has torn the mask from the most astounding impostor and unquestionably the biggest liar in modern history, whose clear and cutting evidence has reduced to its real proportions that orgy of blood and arrogance — the European tyranny of Bonaparte; this book, I say, intensely interesting and valuable as it is, may easily lead us, if it usurp undue space of our reading, to look upon the Revolution as the prelude to the European wars and the instrument of Napoleon, when, in fact, it had twenty other sides as important as that of the war, and hundreds of names who deserve study far better than the great soldier.

No one will understand the incredible condition of that Old Society, out of which the Revolution arose, unless he will study it in the books of Taine and De Tocqueville. M. Taine has piled up with enormous erudition, and has pieced together with singular skill, an array of evidence that brings before us every feature of that old world. But I am not aware that he has substantially added to our knowledge.

The business of a true historian is to see and to think, to look into the past with his own eyes, and to make it live to ours by the light of his own imagination. It is a very inferior task to extract statements from a thousand writers, and then to piece them together into a sort of scintillating Mosaic.

If M. Taine has reduced his picture of the Old Society to a sort of tabulated commonplace book, M. de Tocqueville, in his "Ancien Régime," is forever the Finality Doctrinaire of the Revolution. He is the modern Sieyès, superior to the irrepressible Abbé in learning, in modesty, and in good sense, but still imbued with the same conviction that political science is a subject which he has himself finally completed (*achevée*); that its first and last word is self-government, meaning thereby the judicious rule of all persons of culture.

There are two special sides of the Revolution (and they are the two most important of all) which have never received their due consideration, and which, for the most part, do not get considered at all. The political side of the Revolution has been well and even abundantly treated. But there are two things which have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

never been seriously worked out. The first is the relation of the Revolution, as a whole, to the vast achievements of the eighteenth century in philosophy and science; the science of the world—physics and physiology—first, and secondly, the science of man and human society. The second of these two things is the relation of the Revolution to industrial re-organization, to the social incorporation of the workmen in town and country, to what we call, for short, Socialism, whether in its agricultural or in its manufacturing aspect. The first of these two has relation to the thought of the past; the second to the industry of the future.

The best popular sketch of the relations of the Revolution to the philosophy and science of the eighteenth century is to be found at the close of Henri Martin's great "History of France." In his chapters numbered 96, 99, 100, 101, 103, 105, he has given us a useful *résumé* of the march of thought in religion, politics, physics, and morals. He shows us Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot, and what their influence was on things of the intellect, on the progress of industry, and on the bases of society. Here is the field so little understood by Carlyle. Here we have the soul of the Revolution before us; it is a sketch which every intelligent reader can work out for himself, and the want of it makes so many histories of the Revolution old almanacs of battle and riot.

The second great *lacuna* that I note—the relation of the Revolution to what we now call socialism—is not so easily filled. I know of no book at all complete and competent. Some materials for it are found in the "Histoire du Socialisme," anonymous, printed privately at Lugano. It is useful, as it contains an immense body of documents and manifestoes on every socialist school for a century. We certainly want a true history of socialism, meaning by that a history of every systematic attempt to provide a new social existence for the mass of the workers. In the meantime, we can pick up some hints in M. Michelet's later volumes and in those of M. Louis Blanc, especially in M. Blanc's "Histoire de Dix Ans," 1830–1840, where he gives the story of St. Simon and the insurrection of Lyons. His own books on the organization of labor give the socialist element in the Revolution of 1848, and perhaps M. Lissagaray's work may serve as a history of the commune of 1871. Michelet is the one historian who has given us not only the intellectual and religious elements of the Revolution, but also the heads of its relation to modern socialism.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Unfortunately, the later volumes of M. Michelet are so inferior in power to his earlier volumes, that we get from him on this head little more than hints and suggestions. The only course left to us is to study the monographs which exist of Babeuf, St. Simon, Fourier, Cabet, and Owen, and L. Blanc.

But if we are to study the socialism, on no account let us forget the conservatism of the Revolution. The worst that we could do would be to take a one-sided view of this great crisis. He will know little of it who has not filled his spirit with the Titanic diatribes of Burke and the prophetic denunciations of De Maistre, quite as much as with the thunders of Mirabeau and Danton. No doubt Burke was wrong,—taking all together, and weighing all together,—utterly, immeasurably wrong, in his general judgment on the Revolution; yet wrong as the solution is, he alone has fully conceived the problem.

What Burke is to England and its aristocratic polity, that De Maistre is to France, her historic monarchy, and Catholic Church. As lights and guides in this great *mêlée* we need them all: the conservatives and the reformers, the monarchists and the democrats, the believers and the iconoclasts, all have something to tell us worthy of our hearing. We need Burke to show us the horror he felt at anarchy, De Maistre the grief he felt at the destruction of all idea of Church; we need Michelet's magnificent love of the suffering poor, Carlyle's passionate scorn of imposture, Louis Blanc's unalterable fidelity to the future of the people, De Tocqueville's patient unraveling of inveterate oppression. Of all those who in England and in our day have studied and expounded the Revolution, the most learned as well as the most enlightened guide is to be found in Mr. John Morley. Scattered through his various studies of Voltaire, of Rousseau, of Diderot, of Turgot, of De Maistre, of Carlyle, and in particular his last life of Burke, we shall find the justest as well as the most candid conception of the Revolution as a whole. He is perhaps the only writer, either in this country or abroad, who is able to do justice to all sides, and to all the leaders in due measure, who profoundly sympathizes with the hot tears wrung from the fevered intellect of Burke, and with the hotter tears wrung from the morbid heart of Rousseau; who can honor Voltaire and De Maistre in the same page, and has an enthusiastic conception both of Diderot and of Danton, while not yielding to Michelet or Louis Blanc in zeal for the resurrection

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the people, nor to Mr. Carlyle in aversion to pedantry and anarchy.

But no guides, no historians, and no philosophers will avail us much unless we will ourselves read at first hand, and think on what we read. The true way to read the French Revolution is to go for ourselves to the original sources. No doubt, none but professed students will master the vast store-houses that exist in those two monumental works on the Revolution—the Parliamentary History of Buchez and Roux, in forty octavo volumes, wherein we have the debates and all the public documents, and then the collection of Memoirs, by Berville and Barrière, in some sixty octavo volumes. What power of human effort, thought, and feeling lies stored up in these one hundred volumes—as in some catacomb or pyramid, where the dead of a great age sleep. All the fury, all the passion, all the folly, all the hubbub of the Assembly and the Convention, of the Jacobins and the Cordeliers, recorded day by day. We can hear the heroic paroxysm of Danton, the trumpet-call of Mirabeau, the biting dogmatism of Robespierre, the generous emotion of Vergniaud, the hissing venom of Marat. Or turn to the collection of Memoirs. We have the wicked wit of Besenval, the courtly gossip of poor old Campan, the wise and keen observation of Bailly, or of De Ferrières, the passionate insight of Madame Roland, the terrific story of the agony in the prisons. No! None but professed students have the leisure to master these. But there are two memoirs which, in part at least, all should know; the two most striking personal records that the Revolution has left us. The first is the Memoir of Madame Roland. 'Tis one of the most memorable fragments extant, with its ghastly picture of old France, its photographic insight into the home of a small shop-keeper in old Paris, with its prophetic notes of the first stirrings of the new time, until, as the movement grows in mass, the great historic characters step across the scene, or gather, as it seems, in quiet groups, rehearsing their parts before the drama opens,—Robespierre, Danton, Marat, Vergniaud, Barbaroux. And then she, the daughter of a poor working-man, becomes the friend and confidante of statesmen, the rival of dictators, the superior of Marie Antoinette, the wife of a minister of France, the victim of Robespierre, a state prisoner, till the page breaks off abruptly as the guillotine descends on that fair neck, and severs the keen brain from the untamed heart.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The other indispensable work of contemporary record is found in the famous travels of Arthur Young in 1787, 1788, and 1789. Arthur Young was no genius, but he was a highly competent observer, with an instinct for economic conditions,—honest, intelligent, and possessed of singular opportunities. None but regular students will go through the whole of his voluminous observations. But for one who wishes to know what the Revolution has done, I can imagine no more valuable labor than the comparing these travels of a highly trained English agriculturist, in 1789, with the survey which appeared by Wilson, the other day, just ninety years later, of the same country. But all should read at least A. Young's twenty-first chapter on the Revolution. What a picture of the old-world France it is! Read his account of the haggard men and women, bare and shoeless and stockingless; of the hovels with no glass in the windows, with no light but the door; of the woman whom he talked with near Metz, only twenty-eight, and looking sixty or seventy, crushed by toil and famine. "Ah! monsieur," she said, "les tailles et les corvées nous écrasent!" An Englishman cannot imagine, says honest Arthur, the look of the women in France, all feminine appearance crushed out of them by toil, misery, and hunger. Read this, and then go and see that country now, and that thriving peasantry to-day. That was ninety-five year sago. Read his account of the rights of the lords, of the corvées (forced labor), of the tenant leagues against the payment of rent, of the *droits de seigneur,—droit de silence des grenouilles* (when the lord had a son and heir born, the peasants were obliged to watch all night beating the ponds, so that the frogs should not disturb the baby!). Then, again, how smugglers of salt were flogged, branded, and hung; how weeding and hoeing were forbidden to the peasants for fear of disturbing the young partridges. Read the story of Gordon and Lord Albemarle, and the Lettres de Cachet. Read all this, and then turn to the reports of the debates, and read the account of the great sitting of the night of 4th August, when the nobles surrendered these rights,—partridges, frogs, *lettres de cachet*, and all. Read some of Mirabeau's speeches, and Danton's, and Vergniaud's; read a number or two of Camille Desmoulins's "Vieux Cordelier" and Marat's "Ami de Peuple," the account of the prisons, the trial of Louis XVI., the death of Vergniaud, of Danton, of Condorcet, of Charlotte Corday, of Robespierre, in

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the actual debates, or the memoirs of eye-witnesses. Verily, there is nothing out of Shakespeare so tremendous.

I come now to speak of those two books — the histories of the Revolution which, in France and in England, stand out, I think, before all others, different as they are, but both dramatic poems rather than histories; charged with genius, lit up through and through with burning sympathy for all greatness and all justice — the works of M. Michelet and of Mr. Carlyle. Without comparing them for a moment, both agree in this, that they go to the very soul of things, that they present them to us in a series of living dramas. Of all those historians who have studied the Revolution, M. Michelet has the truest sympathy with it and the profoundest sense of its inner meanings. If his historical learning and his artistic genius had equaled that of Mr. Carlyle, we should have had for once a perfect history.

Who does not know that noble masterpiece of English literature, the poem of Mr. Carlyle? Who has exhausted its infinite humor, pathos, wit, dramatic passion, and tragic terror; its boundless fertility of anecdote and suggestion; its profound earnestness, and almost religious fervor? I believe no history in our language, perhaps no history in any language, quite equals it in poetic richness of dramatic art. The death of Louis XV., with which it opens, may read like an act of Shakespeare or a romance of Fielding. The taking of the Bastille, the insurrection of women, the death of Mirabeau, the end of Louis, of Marie Antoinette, of Danton, the pictures of Marat, of Charlotte Corday, of Madame Roland, of Camille Desmoulins, surely these will ever live in our literature beside the greatest achievements of historic portraiture. Such portraits are more than history, for they rank in their realism with the great creations of poetry. They are more than poetry, for those which I have mentioned may take rank with the most authentic and complete records of history.

But great and perhaps lasting as the literary value of this famous book may be, it is as far as any other from being the final and sufficient history of the French Revolution. That great convulsion, as it was said at the time, swallowed up its children, like the oldest of the gods. It certainly was fatal to its chief actors; and it has been far beyond the powers of all its historians. Year by year,— and nearly fifty years have passed since its first appearance,— Mr. Carlyle's Revolution is more and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

more felt to be a literary picture, and less and less a historical explanation. It is based on an idea now recognized to be thoroughly inadequate; it is saturated with doctrines for which the author himself no longer retained any trust or hope; and it leads us to a conclusion which all that is manly and true in our generation rejects with indignation. A generation ago the influence of it was great; it is now seen to be a poem, with the vision, the movement, the exaggeration of poetry, but without the one indispensable quality for history, solid historical science and true social philosophy. Historical science, social philosophy! those great discoveries and resources of our age, the *Novum Organum* of the world to be, these our Seer scorns with a truly Runic scorn, a laughter that grows at last intolerably artificial and senile. The whole work is based on a false and narrow assumption; for throughout it the Revolution is treated as an insurrection, an outbreak against tyrannies, shams, and lies, a period of anarchy which left nothing behind it but destruction. Now, the history of our entire nineteenth century is precisely the history of all the work that the Revolution did leave. The Revolution was a creating force, even more than a destroying force; it was an inexhaustible source of fertile influences; it not only cleared the ground of the old society, but it manifested all the elements of the new society. If there is one principle in all modern history certain, it is this: That the Revolution did not end with the whiff of grape-shot by which Bonaparte extinguished the dregs of the Convention.

And if the whole story is based on this wrong idea, that in Vendémiaire, year 4, *i.e.*, Oct., 1795, the hour had come and the Man—so the whole tale is saturated with what I make bold to call shallow and cynical ideas. To treat the greatest intellectual, social, religious, industrial movement of all modern history as a mere accompaniment to a barbaric pæan to despotism; to treat the aspirations and resolves of glorious intellects and of a heroic people as a mere target for boisterous mockery; to find in the agony of the purest devotion and in the visions of immortal hopes materials whereby to build up a grotesque phantasmagoria of human folly and impotence, and deride it with a wild ha! ha! of Mephistophelic wit,—all this, alas! is among the perversions of genius. And what is the philosophy or the gospel in the name of which this is done? That, unluckily, is not so clear. It is the philosophy of one who laughs, like another Rabelais, at

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

all philosophers of every school. It is the gospel of one who once was a Calvinist, and who is still a Theist, but whose gospel is, for us forty millions, mostly of fools, still unrevealed, still wrapt in the eternal silences and thirty octavo volumes of wit, eloquence, humor, burlesque, and pathos.

But he who has no philosophy, except to do what his own conscience tells each man is the will of God (*i. e.*, for every man to do what he persuades himself he is entitled to do), has little but gibes for the clearest and most fruitful intellects of the world. To Mr. Carlyle, Voltaire, assuredly one of the most powerful, if not the wisest of those who have scattered ideas through their age, is a "trifler" *(persifleur)*; so, too, Diderot, one of the giants of philosophy, the most universal mind between Leibnitz and Comte, is a "scoundrel"; and Adam Smith, one of the fathers of social science, nay, one of the fathers of modern society, is a "professor of the dismal science." The eighteenth century is "a fraudulent bankrupt," and the French Revolution is its very appropriate "suicide." This is neither history nor poetry, but the railing of Diogenes in his tub.

Diogenes, we know, was letting men see his own self-love, when he seemed to be showing his own nakedness. And it is a sad thought that to a man of genius, such as Mr. Carlyle, these mighty teachers of the human race are at best but learned triflers, and that their influence over the great events that closed their century is treated by him as trivial, or simply noxious. The most profound and meaning page in all modern history is the page wherein there is told the relation of the great thinkers of the eighteenth century to the great social and political movement of the century. All this is not to be disposed of by a somewhat strident scorn in the name of a somewhat mysterious gospel, which the prophet himself is not very ready to explain. Humor, imagination, dramatic power, sincerity, enthusiasm, insight, and noble ideals are good and rare gifts for a historian; but they are not all.

Thus, then, Mr. Carlyle has given us a poem, one of the finest in our language; a sermon, one of the most impressive ever preached; a narrative, one of the most picturesque ever told; an appeal, one of the most enthralling ever uttered; but he has not given us a history of the most important movement in all human civilization. So far as the French Revolution was the simultaneous collapse of an utterly corroded system, so far as it

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was a wild outbreak of anarchy and confusion, so far as it was the burning up by unextinguishable fire of all the impostors on the earth,—and it is most true that it was all these,—so far, Mr. Carlyle has given us one of the most wonderful creations of historic art. But the Revolution was a great deal more than these: and so far as it was the foundation of a new epoch in philosophy, science, industry, government, art, morals, and religion,—and it was all this, and more than this; so far as it was constructive as well as destructive; so far as it stimulated realities and truths even by the fire which burnt up shams and falsehood,—in all this Mr. Carlyle is leading us from light into darkness; so far he is a quack, or even wind-bag; his great poem, if taken as narrative, is a simulacrum, and it forms one of the most rickety, though showy, gigs in the universe of letters.

The influence of that Gargantuan burlesque is fortunately passing into the region of mere imaginative literature. It is felt to-day that the greatest effort ever made by man to refashion the scheme of his life has not left us nothing but tears and confusion. The eighteenth century, of which it was the product, is felt now to be among the most potent and fruitful of any in history. The French people, out of whose heart and blood it issued, are not the mob of monkeys and tigers which the reactionary terror painted them; but the people charged in Europe with the evolution of all our republican and social ideals. Let us, then, say with our poet:

> "Who ponders national events shall find
> An awful balancing of loss and gain,
> Joy based on sorrow, good with ill combined,
> And proud deliverance issuing out of pain
> And direful throes."

FREDERIC HARRISON.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SOCIAL FORCES IN THE UNITED STATES.

A NOVEL called "Democracy," very bright and amusing, was published three or four years ago. It describes life in Washington, from the point of view of a person who has little or no faith in democracy as it works in America; and it is so far enlivened by personal sketches, which people try to identify as portraits, that, besides its real merit, it carries with it the charm which belongs to a riddle. "Who is this?" or "When was that?" we are expected to ask,—and we do.

The novel excited its fair share of interest at home, as a bright and witty satire, very well done. But, so far as I observed, it was not considered anywhere a very important book, nor was it reviewed or cited as if it revealed any very important secrets of the political or social life of this country. But I happened to be in England in the summer of 1882. To my surprise, and somewhat to my amusement, I found "Democracy" everywhere. There were several cheap editions. It was largely discussed in the journals. It was often the subject of serious conversation among well informed and thoughtful people. I found myself obliged to recollect, as well as I could, the names of the characters, and to talk over the movement of the story as I might have talked of a critical debate in Parliament, if I had heard one the night before.

The curious fact that a book which had hardly made a ripple in public estimation here made quite a little war there, after two or three years, occupied my attention. I found myself, a dozen times, obliged to make to my English friends some very commonplace statements about American life. I found that those statements were sometimes challenged by people who had never been in the United States, and who, therefore, knew much more of my country than I do, who have lived here sixty years. This is really my reason for asking public attention to some very

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

familiar observations on social order in America, which I think travelers here are not apt to consider, precisely because they are fundamental. Possibly the journals are not apt to consider them. But, as I suppose, they show not only why "Democracy" is more read in England than in America, but something more. I suppose they show why this country steadily advances in prosperity, happiness, and real success, while, according to the observations most frequently put in print, it would certainly go to destruction in twenty years or less time.

London is the capital of the British empire. If the British empire were governed by such people as "The Ring" of Tweed, Sweeny and Company in New York, it would go at once to destruction. Or, if it were governed by such intrigues as are described in "Democracy" at Washington, it could not long subsist. Now, New York and Washington are called the two capitals of America. In two different senses, they are. Why does not America go to destruction, given such people as Tweed and Sweeny in New York, and granted such intrigue as "Democracy" describes in Washington? This is substantially the question which was put to me, perhaps fifty times in as many days, in England.

It is very difficult to make an Englishman understand the answer. It is much easier to make a Frenchman understand it. De Tocqueville and Laboulaye and Chevalier understood it perfectly. Occasionally, a bright English traveler catches the principle of the answer. Mr. Freeman has caught it, and that charming writer, General William S. Butler, who once walked across North America. But, generally, the Englishman cannot understand, nor believe, that the Edinburghs and Dublins of America are not swallowed up by its one or two Londons. All the same, I shall try to put in print here one or two statements of fact which may perhaps help American travelers when, at some comfortable halting-place in Switzerland, they have to explain to an English friend what will seem to them so absurdly clear as to need no explanation.

The simple truth is, that the United States have no such center of opinion, of fashion, of education, or of politics, as is London. New York is not such a center. Washington is not such a center. On the other hand, the people of the United States do not know, and can hardly be made to understand, how subordinate is the part played in England by what the London

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

journals condescend to call "the provinces." If Congress governed the United States, as Parliament governs the British empire, the importance which my English friends attached to "Democracy" would be fully justified. In point of fact, as every American reader knows, Congress has charge only of a small part of such responsibilities as fall on Parliament,—perhaps a twentieth part of them. The other nineteen-twentieths belong elsewhere,—perhaps three thousand miles away.

When I was in London, a member of Parliament asked the Government what they were going to do in the case of a school-teacher in Ireland, on whose head, four years before, a black-board had fallen. The proper officer replied. Notice had been given, in advance, of this question. The incident took five or ten minutes of a busy night. It was all in good faith. It was not a bit of obstruction. Imagine a question like that in Washington! Strictly speaking, it ought to make a rebellion, if anybody in Washington presumed to ask what had become of a school-mistress's head in Oregon. Now, because Parliament thus attends to the whole British empire, the proceedings of Parliament are of the very first importance. They are reported at great length in the London papers,—very badly reported, if you will trust an old expert in that business, but still at great length. Four and six large pages of a London newspaper will be given to a single day's session. Now, the comparative unimportance to America of the proceedings of Congress is revealed in the fact that any New York paper is quite satisfied if it give one page to the ordinary record of Congress. Seldom does a report exceed two pages. You shall even see a Monday's paper, in which more space is given to the sermons in the New York pulpits of the day before than to the debates of a crowded day in Washington. This does not mean that the people of New York are specially fond of preaching. It is because the affair at Washington is not specially important to the country. And so indifferent are the Washington papers to reporting the proceedings of Congress, that Congress has to pay the expense of "The Congressional Record" to secure a careful report of its own debates and proceedings.

A striking illustration of the central truth of our system appeared in that long summer when General Garfield lay a-dying. From the 2d of July to the 19th of September there was hardly one subject of such importance as required the personal atten-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion of the head of the National Administration. The truth is that the country was governed elsewhere. Washington and the President were responsible only for a very small proportion of its government. This is what is meant by "Self-government," if anybody on the other side of the ocean could be made to understand it. But this seems well-nigh impossible.

The English error in this matter is very natural. English readers see few American papers, singularly few American books. A very large class of our most important books is quite unknown in England. The newspapers and journals which they do see are generally those published in New York, and occasionally those published in Boston and in Philadelphia. Naturally enough, though quite erroneously, they suppose that these cities have the same empire over the thought of America as London has over the thought of the British empire. As poor Lord Salisbury said, "they all use very small maps," if, indeed, they use any, and they really think that two or three cities control American life, because all the American literature they see dates from those cities. Now, it happens that two of those three cities which I have named are virtually Irish cities. They are governed by Irishmen, and, indeed, it is probable that a majority of their adult inhabitants are of recent Irish origin. Those cities, therefore, are as badly governed as is everything else which is governed by Irishmen. The English *dilettante* has made up his mind that these cities govern America, and he naturally comes to the conclusion that America must be very badly governed.

In the hope of meeting this delusion if possible, I have taken some pains to find where, in fact, the literary journals of New York find their readers and their support. The figures which I have obtained will show, what everybody in America knows, that though these journals are printed in New York, they are not printed for the Macs and the O's, the Sweenys and Tweeds, who govern New York, but for a very large constituency scattered over all the nation. They are not printed for a few "highly cultivated" people in two or three large cities, but for a great many cultivated people, who live in all parts of the continent. Thus, of the copies of the NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW mailed from its office, almost exactly one-quarter part is sent west of the Mississippi River. The mailing-list of another literary journal of very large circulation shows that twenty per cent. of that circulation is in New England, twenty per cent. in the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

four Middle States, ten per cent. in the ten Southern States, and fifty per cent. in the region between the Alleghanies and the Pacific. It is true that the mailing-lists are not an absolute criterion. A very large proportion of the circulation of each of these journals does not appear on them, but is cared for by book-sellers and news agents. These dealers, however, number more than five thousand, and are very widely scattered. The proportions, therefore, if made from the whole circulation, would not differ materially from those which I have shown.

I was, ten years ago, the editor of a serious literary journal published in Boston. It received its character from such papers as Dr. Martineau, Dr. Bellows, and Dr. Dewey wrote for it. It had naturally a considerable circulation in New England, because it was published there. But on examining the publisher's correspondence for a single month, I find that, excluding the orders given from New England, as fairly to be called local, thirty per cent. of the remainder were from New York, sixteen per cent. from Pennsylvania, ten per cent. from Illinois, six per cent. from California, as many from the District of Columbia, as many from Minnesota, and the remaining twenty-six per cent. were divided between Iowa, Michigan, Colorado, Wisconsin, Indiana, Maryland, Canada, New Jersey, Washington Territory, Louisiana, Nebraska, Kansas, Nova Scotia, Kentucky, the Hawaiian Islands, and Japan. I have named first the States which took the largest number.

Nor let any person suppose that periodical literature goes into regions that have no other literature. The quality of reading is a very difficult matter to test, but the publishers of the rival editions of the Encyclopedia Britannica tell me that a large proportion of the large sales of that costly and thorough book are made to parties who live west of the Mississippi. One house reports to us that, as far as its own sales go, a quarter part of its very large issues have gone into that region. This means that many thousands of the largest and best encyclopedia in the English language are in that country, of which Robert Livingston said in 1804, "I have assured them (in Paris) that we shall not send an emigrant west of the Mississippi in a hundred years."

We all know that life in the smaller cities or towns is more favorable for habits of reading than life in the large cities. And if any one imagine that the reading of such towns is confined to what is called "popular reading," he is very much mistaken. Two

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

firms of book-sellers in Boston were kind enough to send me their orders received in one day from twelve different towns. The largest and most distant of these was San Francisco, Cal. From that town, in one order on that day, were Greville's Memoirs, Marlowe's Poems, Talleyrand's and Molière's works. The other eleven orders on that particular day called for the following works: 1. Lessing's Works; Wilhelm Meister. 2. Smiles's Self-Help; McCarthy's Nineteenth Century. 3. Philip Brooks's Sermons. 4. Faith and Unfaith; Lessing's Works. 5. Locke's Philosophical Works; Faith and Unfaith. 6. Whately's Logic; History of Switzerland. 7. Light of Asia; Scotch Sermons; Geikie's Life of Christ. 8. Blackie's Lay Sermons; Dean Stanley's Sermons. 9. Geometry and Faith; Ten Great Religions. 10. Darwin's Origin of Species, and other works; Lecky's England; Mediæval History. 11. Graphic Art; Fergusson's Architecture; Palliser's History of Lace; Campbell's Lives of the Chancellors. In each case, I select two or three of the more serious books from each order. The full twelve lists represent perhaps one two-hundredth part of the books which went from Boston that day to the small towns,—and these lists represent perhaps one-tenth part of that two-hundredth.

As to amount of reading, the distribution of the public library of San Francisco is twice that of Boston in proportion to the population. The public library system of the country, again, shows to a certain degree the books the people choose to read.

Here are two orders, received in the same week for two town libraries: 1. Parks and Gardens of the World; Raphael Studies; Michael Angelo; Japanese Ornaments; Chalmers's British Poets; Ruskin's Poems; Edwards's Essays. 2. Freeman's Norman Conquest; Fergusson's Architecture; Anderson's British Poets; Lord Bacon's Works; Morris's Literature of Ancient Greece; Jowett's Plato; Müller's American Art; Symonds's Renaissance. That is one day's supply of two out of three or four thousand libraries.

These figures will do something to show to readers who need enlightenment that though most books are published in the largest cities of America, it by no means follows that it is in those cities that they are read. So far as the use of books is a test of education, it is certain that the educated class of the United States is quite evenly scattered over the whole country.

The very wide distribution of colleges ought to show the same thing. It is convenient for the under-graduates of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

universities on the sea-board to sneer at "fresh-water colleges." But I observe that Yale and Harvard draw some of their best teachers from colleges "which nobody ever heard of," and the point I have now to make is, that there would not be three or four hundred institutions requiring Latin and Greek and some high mathematical training as part of their course, unless there were very widely scattered an educated class which directs society, insisting on the higher education. Apart from the undergraduate nonsense about "fresh-water colleges," the intelligent men of the country know how to respect the endowments and the staff of the University of Wisconsin, the University of Virginia, the University of St. Louis, the University of Michigan, and Cornell University, at Ithaca, as belonging in the same class of institutions as the Johns Hopkins University, Columbia College, Yale College, and Harvard College. The endowments of some of these Western colleges are more than princely. Princes have never made such endowments. And their administration is wise. I do not mean to imply that Montana, Colorado, or even Illinois or Michigan is crowded with people who can discuss Greek accents, or who talk about the last sweet thing relating to quaternions. I speak of the colleges simply to show the drift of feeling in the West, and its readiness to encourage the best cultivation of which people know. You would not have universities, each with four or five millions of endowment, in regions indifferent to the higher education; and you would not have them in regions where men of the higher education were merely exceptional. You only have them in regions where such men are among the leaders of the social order.

Of course, it is difficult to show, by statistics, just where such people are. But it has seemed to me that a good test would be the analysis of the list of Fellows of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. The members of this institution are all from the United States or the British Dominion. They choose from their own number the Fellows, who are all men engaged in science, or who have materially aided in its advancement. Of these Fellows, there are five hundred and twenty-one. It is interesting to see how they are territorially divided. We have to eliminate, as these gentlemen would themselves say, one or two abnormal factors. First, the officers of the army and navy and of the scientific surveys conducted by the National Government return their addresses as at Wash-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ington, though in fact, in many cases, they spend the active part of the year, perhaps the whole of it, far away. Second, the association was chartered in Massachusetts. It has held more meetings there than in any other State, and the place of meeting, to a certain extent, affects the number of members. Again, the largest university in America is in Massachusetts, and the number of its scientific professors, to a certain extent, enlarges the Massachusetts quota. Allowing for these disturbances, the reader will see that for the country at large the distribution of the Fellows of this scientific society ranges over the Northern, Western, and Pacific States in a ratio curiously near to their population. The Southern States, or their leaders, for their own purposes have chosen to keep well out of any such calculations. Of the five hundred and twenty-one Fellows, ten belong in the British Dominion. Of the remaining five hundred and eleven, ninety-six belong to Massachusetts and fifty-eight to Washington, which are, for the reason I have mentioned, exceptional. There remain three hundred and fifty-seven names, which are divided among the following States in the number indicated: New York, seventy-four; Pennsylvania, thirty-nine; Connecticut, thirty-nine; Ohio, thirty-one; New Jersey, twenty-four; Illinois, seventeen; Missouri, sixteen; Maryland, fifteen; Michigan and Rhode Island, ten each; California and Indiana, eight each; Kentucky, seven; Wisconsin, six; Tennessee, New Hampshire, and Iowa, five each; Virginia, four; Vermont, West Virginia, North Carolina, and Utah, two each; Delaware, Georgia, Alabama, Louisiana, Nebraska, Kansas, Texas, one each. The other States have no Fellows.*

Not to adduce more of such statistics, here is the truth regarding our social order: Where enough people live together, for the growth of the better social institutions, there are enough people of education and refined habit to take the lead of that

* Readers who have no census tables at hand may be interested to compare this list with the order of the same States for population. It is this: New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Missouri, Indiana, Kentucky, Michigan, Iowa, Texas, Tennessee, Georgia, Virginia, North Carolina, Wisconsin, Alabama, New Jersey, South Carolina, Kansas, Louisiana, Maryland, California, Minnesota, West Virginia, Nebraska, New Hampshire, Delaware, Vermont, Rhode Island, Colorado. The number in Connecticut, New Jersey, Maryland, and Rhode Island has been raised above the average by the presence in these States of Yale College, of Princeton College, of the Johns Hopkins University, and of Brown University.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

social order and to lead it well. Good sense and good breeding go to the front, as their very names imply that they will. And to the question why "Democracy" excited so little attention here, the answer is that at least forty other centers thought themselves quite as important as Washington. Good society in Detroit and Columbus and Burlington and Albany, and five hundred other places, had in each case its own interests; if you please, its own gossip and its own scandal. It was far too much interested in its own affairs to distress itself a great deal about the fact that "Democracy" thought ill of people in Washington. It read "Democracy"; but it did not much care that some bright unknown writer who had spent a great deal of life in Europe was soured by what he or she saw in Washington. Had you accosted a person at an evening party in Goshen or Akron, or some other town you never heard of, and asked about the book, he would have said, after he had made sure you did not write it, "I do not think that Washington governs America."

Go to Washington any summer, and see what a hard life the Newspaper Row people have in making up the rigmarole which they call news, which they shall contradict the next day; while all the heads of department are away, leaving one official to telegraph to the acting Vice-President, if by ill-luck the President, at his retreat, should break his neck. Or, stay at home, and consider how days or weeks pass without any allusion to what Washington has to say or do outside the newspapers. People are interested in home affairs, talk about those affairs, and give only a small share of their attention to the subject discussed the day before in Washington. Thus, the question of the quality of sugar which the Government of the nation provided for Bare-bones or Red Cloud, occupied the attention of the critics of the National Administration for some weeks a few years ago. It was exactly as important as the question as to the quality of sugar which the State of Missouri provided for its insane hospitals, or the State of New York for its home for inebriates. It was neither more important nor less. The quantity of supply was probably much less than in either of those cases. Now, the fact that it is discussed at Washington does not deceive the American, used to the American constitutions. True, a Washington correspondent may fill half a column with it in hard stress for material. But the American citizen is not deceived. He does not read the half column. He

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not care much for the discussion. He knows that substantial justice will probably be done, or he hopes so. Any way, he means to attend to the part of the business that belongs to him. If the people at the center botch very badly the part that belongs to them, he will turn them out some day. But he does not make the mistake of thinking that their brown sugar is more important than his brown sugar, because it happens to be bought from the national treasury. This is to say, in a figure, that what are called the affairs of the nation, which are transacted at Washington, do not approach to the magnitude or the importance of the affairs of the country, which are transacted elsewhere.

Meanwhile, in all these centers — Goshen, Akron, Fremont, Mentor, Burlington, Ann Arbor, Springfield, Syracuse, and a thousand others — are growing up men of affairs. On some fine day the country, in what seems a blind way, reaches out its hand to find a man who shall take the oversight of the National Administration. From one such place it picks out Abraham Lincoln; from another it picks out James Abram Garfield. Then you strike an attitude, and say: "Ah! these were exceptional men. Very extraordinary; but General Garfield read 'Horace.'" It is not extraordinary at all. The way in which the country is governed — not at a center, but in the places where the government is needed — gives you such men. You do not look for them merely in bureaus of central administration. You look for them, and you find them, wherever there has been government to admininister, or other good work to be done.

E. E. Hale.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED